DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 765 SP 006 913

AUTHOR	Woodruff, Phillip H.
TITLE	British Primary Education - Components of Innovation.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Assessment and Coordination.
PUB DATE	Aug 71
NOTE	134p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Role; Educational Innovation; *Educational Programs; International Education; *Open Education; *Primary Education; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	*British Education; Oxfordshire

ABSTRACT

Herein are discussed the reactions of visitors to the Oxfordshire schools; the new elements common to education in all the Oxfordshire schools, including vertical grouping, "unstreaming," open education, the integrated day, and the integrated curriculum; the role of the teachers in Oxfordshire's primary schools; the role of various agencies and institutions in the Oxfordshire primary schools, including the advisory service, Her Majesty's inspectors, the museum service, the teachers' centers, and the schools council; and the lessons for American education that can be drawn from Oxfordshire's primary schools. (Editor)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Rec'd 9/7/71

ED 081765

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BRITISH PRIMARY EDUCATION -
Components of Innovation

Phillip H. Woodruff
Director of Social Studies
Westport(Conn.) Public Schools

SP 006 913

Preface

This is a report on the innovative practices in British primary education, on how those practices have come into being and how they are sustained and developed further.

Readers should understand, at the outset, that the information contained in this report was gathered from first hand observation and from interviews with English educators in Oxfordshire during the summer of 1971. The experience of investigating schools and holding a wide range of interviews was intense. The information on schools and innovations is as accurate as possible, given the constraint of time. In no way do I wish to suggest that what is true of Oxfordshire schools is true of all English county schools or to the schools of the West Riding of Yorkshire, Leicestershire, or Bristol ——schools referred to by many Oxford educators as being innovative.

My investigation into the innovative character of British schools, as represented by Oxfordshire schools, owes much to Dr. Vincent Rogers, University of Connecticut, and to Mr. John Coe, Senior Adviser, Oxfordshire Schools. My thanks go to my wife, Mary Lou Woodruff, whose sensitive observations and recording of the lives of school children are without equal.

Phillip H. Woodruff
Westport, Connecticut
August 1971

I

Few things are harder to put up with than the annoyance of a good example.
— Mark Twain, Pudd'nhead Wilson

Oxfordshire lies to the north and west of London, a lovely county of rolling hills, heavy with summer's green, a patchwork of fields marked off with hedgerows and tree lines, an area where the rural way of life is close at hand. Small villages and towns, each apparently quite removed from its neighbor, are linked together by narrow, winding roads. Oxford, the city, like other cities of the area, shows the signs of recent growth. A ring road circles the city and strings together neighboring communities into a suburban complex. Construction equipment is at work on highways and at building sites. One senses in this county, once so deeply rural, the quickening pace of chance. Villages and towns which at first glance seemed unchanged reveal on closer examination new roadway developments, extensive housing estates, factory areas, and commercial districts. [illegible] on the dispersal of business and industry from Birmingham and Coventry, remark how there are people

who commute to London, debate the merits of greater numbers moving into their county. Beneath the apparent calm and rustic circumstances of Oxfordshire there exists a tension between a way of life that was and one that has not yet fully emerged. It is appropriate that Oxfordshire, an ancient center of learning, should be one of a number of sites of significant educational change in England, and that Oxfordshire's professional educators should be among those who in Britain are in the forefront of educational leadership.

John Coe, Senior Adviser of the Oxfordshire County Schools, is a slight, intense man. When he talks of education, he leans forward, grasping his knees, turning his face to address his remarks directly to his interrogator. His eyes sparkle and a flashing grin occasionally relieves the serious and carefully chosen words he uses. Again and again, Coe returns to his main theme, to what he terms "the quality of life" for the children in the schools. His energies, like those of his six fellow advisers who form the advisory service he runs, have been devoted to the evolution of schools, notably primary schools, wherein the quality of life is vastly different today than it was in former times. So attractive to educators in America has been the innovations of the British primary schools, the changes in the quality of life, that they have drawn to Britain, to Oxfordshire, an ever-increasing number of visitors. In the month of June 1971, Coe and his colleagues arranged for over eight hundred visitor-hours of inspection of the schools of Oxfordshire.

What is it these visitors seek? The American administrators and teachers who journey to England to see these

new schools are attracted by the educational potentialities of the British infant school, or "open education," or the "integrated day," or "family grouping," or "child-centered schools,"——all terms relating to various aspects of educational innovations, some or all of which may be found in over fifty per cent of the primary schools of Oxfordshire, seventy or more of the 165 schools of the county. The terms used to identify the innovative developments in these primary schools admit a wide variety of interpretations and definitions. There is, nonetheless, a general agreement among advocates of this educational philosophy and its school and classroom manifestations that it fosters and sustains more opportunities for children to enjoy humanistic, individualized means of achieving affective and cognitive growth than does traditional educational philosophy and its educational forms. It is the presumed potential of this education mode which attracts so many American educators.

Most visitors to these Oxfordshire schools, as to other such schools in Leicestershire or Bristol or elsewhere in Britain, do agree that the quality of life for English children has truly changed. Not all would agree that the change necessarily has, as a concommitant to an improvement of the way of life for children in the schools, an improvement in the quality of learning. It is precisely at this point that a controversy is joined which must, if only briefly, concern us at this point. Champions of the new modes of British education for children, including many visiting Americans, share in varying degree the view that the elusive and continuingly emerging qualities of each child's individuality do not admit of values accruing to a prescribed curriculum. They reject formulating

learning activities for children based on norms of achievement or certain expectancies of children of a certain age or measured ability. They do not believe that impositions should be made on the child since his stage of development, his own interests, his schoolroom associations with other children, his inclination to want to use natural materials, and his curiosity about specific elements in his environment will inform and structure his learning. For children operating in school in this context, a teacher is a guide, a resource, an encourager, one who responds with sensitivity and intelligence to the child's expression of interest and curiosity. We find this view expressed in this manner:

> Good teachers are willing to let children experience many aspects of a situation and respond in many ways. They are aware that it is futile and harmful to try to specify in advance just what is happening in each encounter a child has with things, people or symbols.[1]

Those who express skepticism of the new modes of education in British schools do so, not because they are unaware of the values in humanistic, individualized schools, but because they maintain the conviction that schools are organized to teach something which children should learn. In the interests of the children themselves as well as in the interests of society, they contend, there is a body of skills, a set of attitudes, a content substance which can be, in some appropriate manner, organized into a curriculum. To the end of achieving the realization of the objectives of the curriculum, then, materials can be prepared, and pupil progress may be assessed some systematic and relatively objective manner.

One thoughtful critic summarizes this position:

> . . . . . academic subjects, so called, have evolved as they have simply because they have proved to be the most economical and lucid way of handling the undifferentiated mass of phenomena we experience in the natural and social worlds around us or in the internal life of our feelings and emotions . . . The notion that a child must follow through all the stages of human development under the steam of his own capacity to discover what his predecessors have already found out is ridiculous. It is part of our human ability to be able to package, in assimilable form, information (concepts and relevant facts) which children can then digest at a rate which the original discovers would have found astonishing . . . the job of the school is to find the best way of presenting them. . . .[2]

Whether one subscribes to one side of the argument or to the other is not the central issue here: the issue does exist. It frequently is cast in terms of "progressivism" as opposed to "traditionalism," and the innovations taking place in British primary schools, and now working up into secondary schools, are almost wholly "progressive" innovations. This innovative thrust, for convenience hereafter referred to as "open education," has come to be supported by local educational authorities in such places as Oxfordshire, sustained and encouraged by the National Schools Council, fostered in some university and institute centers of educational research and of teacher training, spread abroad through newly developing teacher centers in some local educational authorities. [illegible] Peters, [illegible] Lecturer in the Department of Educational Studies, University of Oxford expressed it thusly:

> An enormous amount of innovation has been taking place in this country, and this has come really from two major sources: one are the schools themselves, and the other is a new organization called the Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations which is very largely teacher controlled.[3]

Let us now turn our attention to some of these school-based innovations, many of which came into existence without any real supporting educational research or fully developed educational theory.

II

> Herein lay the spring of the mechanical art and mystery of educating the reason without stooping to the cultivation of the sentiments and affections. Never wonder. By means of addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, settle everything somehow, and never wonder. Bring to me, says M'Choakumchild, yonder baby just able to walk, and I engage that it shall never wonder.
>
> — Charles Dickens, Hard Times

Many Oxfordshire primary schools are a good examples of open, integrated day education, but no one school is like another in the manner in which it manifests openness and integration: it is precisely this that makes it so difficult to characterize with precision a British infant school model, or a junior school model, or a primary school model. One must always be prepared to say, "Well, yes, that's the way it is at Hill View Primary School in Banbury, but it's not really that way at Speedwell Infants in Littlemore." Yet Hill View and Speedwell share common elements.

Vertical Grouping

In an infant classroom there may be as many as forty children between the ages of 5 and 7+, the five year olds being "in-take" pupils or reception pupils brought in that term or one of the preceding two terms of the year. The majority of pupils have been in the room two or more terms. Brothers and sisters may be in the same room, or a class may be made up of neighborhood children in this age range. In any case, the children know one another and have the opportunity to develop their own groups of friends. The children move into a stable, ordered classroom in which the older children, the experienced hands as it were, relieve the teacher of the heavy burdens of inducting a whole class of newcomers into the strange and often frightening routines of school. Typically these children will remain together with the same infant teacher for two years before moving on to the junior stage of school. The infant school encompasses the ages of five to seven plus, the junior school taking over from seven to eleven plus. The two segments, infants and juniors, comprise the primary school which used to be and no longer is followed by the Eleven Plus examinations. Family grouping or vertical grouping has become a feature of innovative Oxfordshire schools, as it has of schools elsewhere in England.

> In a school where Family Grouping is used, a child remains in the same class, with the same teacher, for the whole period of his Infants' school life.
>
> Entering with a few (perhaps five to eight other newcomers), he joins a class which will already contain ten to twelve children of rising six year olds, and a further ten to twelve rising seven year olds, all of whom have spent their Infants' school life up to that point in the same classroom taught by the same teacher (unless there have been staff changes).[1]

When it comes time for the children to move on to the junior school, they may move to a separate building sometimes quite removed physically as well as philosophically from the infant school. When one building or one complex of buildings houses both infants and juniors under the leadership of a single head teacher (principal), the likkelihood of a close articulation of approach is more certain. Nonetheless, there is a rupture in the educational progress of pupils, mitigated by the fact that the juniors move into an upper division which is again family grouped. As English educators note,

> Where progressive methods are used in both the infant and junior schools, children soon recognize that their new society consists largely of older and more mature children. The purpose and pattern of life is similar to that of the infant school and this bolsters the child's confidence and security. The school is child-centered . . .[2]

Indeed, as it had been in the infant school when the child first entered, so it is in the junior school.. There are older

children to induct newcomers into the ways of the school, the layout of the building and its educational opportunities, and into associations with the classroom teachers.

Commonly a teacher, either at the infant or the junior stage, has assigned to her forty mixed age children with fewer "beginners" in the Fall Term than in the Spring or in the Summer Terms.

> A family group of infant children will arrive and join a class in which there are already approximately twenty second year children who have spent a year in the same room with the same teacher. Many of them will have already been in the same class as the new children whilst they were in infant school.[3]

Since it is a policy for Oxfordshire to maintain small schools close to the neighborhoods from which the children come, it is likely that the school's enrollment of infants or juniors may not exceed a range running roughly from 240 to 320, and these might be formed into two half-sized units with the teachers and an aide forming teams to work with all the pupils in the unit.

> The children are divided into three classes, with family grouping . . . The staff of four (per 120 pupils) work as a team, providing as great a variety of activities as possible.[4]

In remote rural areas, it is still possible to find one teacher schools and more than one observer of the British scene has remarked that open education, so progressive in outward appearances, has familiar one room school characteristics.

"Unstreaming

As unlikely as it might seem, "unstreaming" nonetheless refers to a practice rich in implications for the new modes of British education. Indeed, it is unlikely that open education could have taken root and flourished as it has if streaming and the selection practices associated with it had not been set aside. As the Plowden Report states:

> 811. Streaming involves selecting. In schools which are streamed throughout, children are selected at seven. We know of no satisfactory method of assigning seven year old children, still less those who are even younger, to classes graded by attainment or ability.[5]

Streaming has something of a counterpart in the American practice of ability grouping, but British streaming, with selection examinations at seven and until recently again at eleven plus, may have been more of a determinant of thepupil's educational direction and future than American ability grouping. In any event, both practices represented attempts to identify the pupils' abilities and to group pupils of like abilities together in what were regarded as homogeniously grouped classes. It was thought — and continues to be so regarded by many teachers — that teaching an ability grouped class was more effective since methods, materials, courses and programs could be more precisely tailored to the what were presumed to be the interests, needs, and abilities of the children.

Early surveys of teacher opinion in Britain revealed that junior teachers favored streaming. However, as the Plowden Report notes, ". . . professional opinion is swinging more rapidly against streaming than is public opinion generally."[6] Now, in the early years of the seventies, it would seem that streaming in Oxfordshire schools has ceased to be a major feature of primary education. Since family grouping or vertical grouping brings together in the classroom children of mixed ages, it is presumed that there is a wide range of abilities and this, rather than being seen as a detriment to education, is regarded as a benefit. In such an instance, an infant class might have some children who do not read at all as well as some children who read as well as upper junior pupils. Similarly, there may be children who barely recognize numbers and children who are well advanced in numeracy. The Plowden Reports conclusion indicate the favorable view taken of unstreaming:

> . . . Schools which treat children individually accept unstreaming throughout the whole school. When such an organization is established with conviction and put into effect with skill, it produces a happy school and an atmosphere conductive to learning.[7]
>
> If the arguments against streaming are valid, then the only alternative is to teach classes of mixed ability. This in turn sets severe limitations to the effectiveness of class teaching.[8]

Indeed, if a school gives up streaming, classroom teachers find themselves back in the old position; hence, it is not possible to

stop with just unstreaming. The whole structure of a teacher with her class in a subject must come tumbling down. Having gone this far, vertical grouping comes into play as a way of providing classes with young pupils who, in self-selecting groups, can learn from their classmates what it is that classmates can teach by word or example or demonstration. The teacher is then left free to do those things only she can do or those things which she does best.

The most important result of family grouping, then, is that it provides each class —to use that term loosely—with a cadre of teacher's helpers. However, in the process of implementing this manner of organizing groups, standard or traditional subject matter, as a central concern of the teacher's instructional efforts, wanes in importance and the organization of the classroom environment to provide the richest possible range of experiences for children emerges. Now in this rich environment, the teacher may proceed to work with individual pupils or self-generating groups who, at this interest center or that, take up this question or that activity, or they may set to work together on a theme or a topic of interest. Family grouping thus gives a teacher a range of pupils, a rich mixture of personalities and potentialities. To fully realize the possibilities of the pupils and of the setting, both the teacher and the pupils must be freed, it is thought, from certain traditional school constraints. There will be a need for "open" school conditions and there will be a need for some kind of

integration of educative endeavors.

Open Education

Open, in its simplest sense, may mean that space in and about a school, heretofore not used for instructional or educational purposes, is made available to pupils. Open in this very limited sense is contrasted to "closed," that condition which conjures up images of children sitting at assigned desks in a single room, moving about the room only with permission. Behind these simple views are a set of ideas and attitudes which ultimately fill out the meaning of open education for those who are its champions. R.S. Barth catches some of this:

> Open education is a way of thinking about children about learning and about knowledge; it is characterized by openness. There is a physical openness of schools. Doors are ajar, children come and go in the space within the school and without. Classrooms are open and children bring objects of interest to them in and take objects of interest out. Space in the open classroom is not preempted by desks and chairs organized in rows or in any other way. There is a variety of spaces filled with a variety of materials. Children move in this openness from place to place, from activity to activity. Both the world inside and outside the school is accessible to them. Space is fluid and changes with changing needs. The curriculum is open. . . open to choices by adults and by children as a function of the interests of children. The curriculum is the dependent variable upon which the child must depend.[9]

The concept of openness clearly embraces more than mere physical space. It requires that one subscribe to a rather different set of beliefs about the nature of schools themselves as well as about curriculum and the role of the teacher. In the open school, the school becomes an educational instrumentality itself, a constantly changing world from which children learn through experience with their environment and from each other, not merely a house for activities which flow from materials introduced into a classroom by a teacher at which pupils work under her direction. Seen this way, then, school buildings —the interiors as well as the exteriors—and the way they are designed and arranged, furnished and equipped, lighted and decorated are no longer passive houses for the acts of teachers and pupils, but active agents of education, giving educational opportunities to pupils, beckoning them to work in certain ways here, in other ways there, commanding silence at this place and fostering discussion and activity at this place.

Some teachers, accustomed to the more traditional approaches to education, are uncomfortable in open classroom conditions. No doubt their discomfiture is increased by the absence of definite subject matter time segments, scheduling or what the British refer to as "timetabling." However, another aspect of open education is the absence of a definitive master schedule of school time. It is simply no longer feasible to so schedule subjects if pupils

are of mixed ability and age and are, indeed, encouraged to select from among the smorgasbord of interest centers and activities in the room. As Arthur Razzell writes:

> Until fairly recently the generally accepted method of teaching in the junior school was by means of a carefully planned weekly time-table of lessons. They were usually of thirty to forty minutes' duration but periods devoted to the study of arithmetic or English often lasted longer. The time-table for each class was drawn up by the head teacher, who sought to provide the children with a balanced daily programme which ensured that a concentrated period of bookish learning was followed by a period which was less mentally fatiguing —drill, singing, art or craft, for example.
> . . . . . .
> The whole of the weekly framework of lessons was designed to give an appropriate number of minutes to each of the subjects studied. . . .
> . . . . . .
> Gradually teachers began to realize that only in the very narrowest sense could a subject be regarded as 'pure.' More often it was a mixture of disciplines. . . . . .
> . . . . . .
> Some teachers noticed that when children were deeply involved in work of this kind they were loath to stop at the end of a period. . . .[10]

One additional element of openness needs mentioning. When formal classroom structure is eliminated, when mixed age children are together, when time-tabling or scheduling of subject matter courses no longer occurs, it must follow as a matter of logic that the educational aims for which such as system was contrived are no longer applicable. The older or more traditional or more formal school was a manifestation of the society of its time, one

which set for children the goal of mastering a given set of skills and a given body of content at a minimum, often unspecified, level, which then allowed children to 'go out into the world." The world changed slowly, almost imperceptibly. Dr. Bentley Glass, Academic Vice-President of The State University of New York, Stony Brook, writes of the change which has been thrust upon education:

> No critique of education today should avoid the enormously rapid increase in the sum of human knowledge, and the consequent rapid social and cultural change which grows out of technological applications of scientific discoveries and which takes place within a fraction of the human life span. . . . . .
> . . . . . .
> We would lead the student to acquire certain fundamental skills only in order that he might pursue a line of investigation into a truly independent, "open-ended" inquiry.[11]

Openness, as related to primary education, is part of a larger picture having to do with significantly changed educational aims and how these aims are related to the fulfillment of society's goals. If, indeed, changes now sweep through society "within a fraction of the human life span," as Glass asserts, the development through the schools of children capable of living with change, capable of independent judgment and thought, capable of creative or imaginative responses to their world, capable of achieving security or personal stability or serenity in the midst of change seems to be a highly desirable educational goal. The main goal then is far less that of producing from schools "good citizens," which implies a kind of mass conformity to established societal norms,

and far more that of providing a changing society with personally competent, creative, secure individuals who may continue to learn from their world. Of course, one may argue the premises of this discussion, but, irrespective of one's views, it is decidedly to the point that openness, as manifested in Oxfordshire schools as well as elsewhere, be related to the deep social and cultural currents which now flow through our scientifically and technologically developed societies.

The Integrated Day

When scheduling or time-tabling, as an organizational scheme for assuring the coverage of a certain body of subjects, is banished from the school, then some means of organizing and sustaining over time educational activities and enterprises must come into existence. It is this that is commonly comprehended by the term, "The Integrated Day."

> The integrated day could be described as a school day which is combined into a whole and has the minimum of timetabling. Within this day there is time and opportunity in a planned educative environment for the social, intellectual, emotional, physical and aesthetic growth of the child at his own rate of development. Our definition extends this day to encompass the whole life of the child during the six years of primary education.[12]

One finds it difficult to work with definitions of this order. One senses more enthusiasm than clarity, but it at least gives some large stopping points for further examination. ". . . a planned educative environment" is another way of saying that there

ce a chi" can find the resources for mathematics,
or for reading or writing, or for art and crafts,
previously timed divisions of subject matter are
represented in the school room. One does not
ch art from 10.00 to 10:30 A.M. but children work
that part of the room given over to art supplies
Similarly, children go to a part of a room,
p of tables, on which are located a wide variety
apparatus. If one carries out this principle of
, organized physical locations for all that was
. by a teacher in a scheduled day, clearly it becomes
'ficult to use old classroom facilities without some
.cations.
.se a wide range of pupils working at various locations,
onough activities of every possible kind is a large
ıcher. Integration comes to include such things,
teaching and multi-room development so that
ısibilities may be shared, and so that specific
ıl rooms can be given over to specializations. Thus,
, at such schools as the Queensdyke School in
eensway School in Banbury, as well as many other,
are constructed in which there are no classrooms,
e teachers, each having a home bay, off a central
elf a series of alcoves and open areas, work with
at scheduling remains is necessitated by the

requirements of attendance-taking, the needs of the lunch hour, the necessity to use the PE equipment in the commons area ——a combined lunch-assembly hall-gymnasium. At these schools, children come together as classes for specific purposes (attendance taking and the like) and, as a result of a joint decision of the teachers involved, for a quiet story time.

At story time, which may conclude the school day, teachers may read stories at different levels of interest and difficulty; thus, some pupils may be gathered in one bay hearing one kind of story while the other children, depending on age or interest, may be in other bays. An inevitable result of this sharing of children is that the teachers come to know all the pupils, not just those in their home bay class. Thus, team the styles of teaching reflect the circumstances of physical and curricular considerations. In this sense, then, the teacher's work is integrated into the physical surrounding, integrated into the cooperative endeavors of colleagues with whom she must plan and work, and integrated into the time of the day itself. An intricate tapestry of cooperatively developed patterns emerges. Three teachers, individually and severally, are artists who construct the educational milieu for children and give it life and fulfillment.

A sidelight, exceedingly important but tangential at this point to the central issue of the integrated day, is that schools working in this mode must come to have a new and different set of relation-

—curriculum directors, principals, central office people. The hierarchy which now exists and which finds the teacher on the botton of the professional scale, just above those who serve her —custodians, aides, and secretaries—changes dramatically.

". . .at his own rate of development" is the key to individualization. There is no lockstep progression through a subject. Rather it is common to hear British educators in these schools refer to the natural rhythms of children. It is accepted that some children shall take rather more readily to one kind of work or study and perhaps not even take to another kind at all. With patience, with keen observation, with an understanding of child growth and development, teachers can soon become aware of each child's particular rhythms. Where we might find traditional teachers expressing anxiety about how far behind a pupil is falling, or how inadequate the performance of a certain child might be, teachers in the open education mode express considerably more security about variations in pupil achievement and progress. When the traditional teacher might cite a number of low test scores to indicate the less than expected or desired performance of a child, an open education teacher might talk to the meaning and progress revealed in examples of a pupil's work. She might cite her on-going anecdotal record of his classroom behavior at the various interest or study centers and with his fellow classmates. Moreover, because the teacher —or the team of teachers—will have

the child in a family grouped classroom setting for all of the infant years or junior years —the primary years— the opportunity to follow his development over long periods of time and to pass him on to colleagues who, similarly, will have him over a long period of time removes some of the concern about the rate of achievement a child is experiencing at any given moment. Indeed, it seems that individualization may occur only when a child has an opportunity to be an individual ——one who grows and learns at his rate, not at some fixed rate or established norm. This is the way one author describes it:

> Whilst observing children in an integrated day situation, it is noticeable that each child has his individual pattern and rhythm of working. Some children start work immediately they arrive in the classroom, having perhaps decided previously what they intend to do and they will have prepared for it by reading, thinking, making notes or bringing materials. Another child may come into school with a completely open mind with no particular interest to follow. His attention will be attracted by an activity in the room and he may spend the rest of the day absorbed in his work. Another may hop from one activity to another, never becoming deeply involved in any situation. Some may decide what to do but may be unable to start without discussing their plans with a classmate or the teacher. There will be others who will be drawn into a group activity and make a useful contribution to the subject at hand. Some children will get their interest from a group and then withdraw to follow the interest alone. Occasionally a less interested child may find difficulty in involving himself in any situation. To pressurize the apparently disinterested child will only build up a resistance within him which may prove difficult to break down. The teacher should try to discover what really does interest him and whether this uninterested attitude may be symptomatic of a deeper disturbance. We

> hope that the children will not be afraid to have a go at most things and it is quite remarkable to notice how success in applying one idea in one situation gives added confidence to a child and he will transfer his success to another area of learning.[13]

Such a description is enough to set a traditionalist's teeth on edge. It would appear to be an open invitation to the complete abandonment of any standards. As though Brown and Precious know the difficulties, they comment:

> In fact, the greatest problems are fears which come from within the teacher. External pressures which may be causing fear of criticism or fear of failure undermine the teacher's self-reliance and she will need great determination to continue in the face of these.[14]

One suspects that "external Pressures" may be a circumlocution for educators and parents who raise serious questions about the ability of children to take up activities which will be significant, about the achievement pupils will make when left to their own devices, about some of the social relationships which may be established when young children are, perhaps, dominated by older children. It is such doubts as these, and perhaps others, which unless stamped out by a fierce act of will and the faith of a true believer, are re-awakened when the less committed or less fervent skeptic or critic comes along.

One senses that many visitors to these schools continue to carry around in their heads this mental reservation. They like what they see, but somehow they can't quite square all that freedom, all that apparent absence of structure they know, with achievement

in basic skills and significant content. They are not alone in this feeling. G.W.J. Crawford in an article entitled perhaps a little too sanguinely, "The Primary School: A Balanced View", writes:

> In my view, periods of free activity, which can go on for a very long time in the so-called 'integrated day', need to be interspersed with periods of formal work, if only to give children a restful atmosphere for a change, and I well recall a small child saying to me, "I do wish Miss would keep us quiet."[15]

Crawford's comment comes very near to the heart of the matter. "Formal work" is seen by skeptics or critics as the real stuff, that which truly imparts what children must have. There's nothing free about that; it is meant to be demanding, serious, and required. The inclusion of such "formal work" would assure, of course, that at least some of the day was being profitably used for education.

Another observer remarks:

> It was with no surprise that I also learned that at this school that each new teacher is given a number of sheets of advice to help him ensure his inegrated day is a profitable educational arrangement. The spirit of this advice can be illustrated by a quotation from one paragraph where he warns against children's work becoming fragmentary and aimless and of 'the danger of a lack of ordered progression and a hotchpotch of unrelated experiences and ideas which lack meaning as a whole.[16]

That new teachers need guide sheets of information to assure "a profitable educational arrangement" has as much to do with the

inexperience of the teacher as it does with the integrated day organizational structure for learning activities. It would be appropriate to provide a new teacher with some kinds of directional help in any organizational set-up, strict and formal to the least strict and most informal. The integrated day does, however, present problems for which the provision for guide sheets seems appropriate. In the swirl of activities of an apparently unstructured day, it may be terribly easy for teachers and pupils to lose sight of the educational goals which are the purposes of the school. A head teacher and his staff might draw up such a statement of educational goals as a preventitive against educational meandering. However, the need for such guides cannot be presumed to be an indictment of the integrated day.

In his thoughtful essay, Ieuan Lloyd makes a number of telling remarks about the integrated day:

> The removal of a timetable may well help the teacher to employ a more individual method in his teaching, methods which help a child to grasp the sense of what he is doing, but such an understanding is not a direct effect of that removal; it may be no more than a necessary condition for it . . . . . .
> . . . . . .
>
> To sum up here, the absence of a timetable may allow greater freedom to adapt one's teaching to individual children and nothing but good can come from that, but as with all freedom, if not carefully watched, its vices may become as numerous as its virtues.[17]

The integrated day places a tremendous burden of responsibility upon a teacher, or on a group of teachers if team teaching is possible.

There must be a place to teach reading and that place must be filled with the materials which will be needed by every pupil. Readers, work cards, flash cards, letters, reading schemes such as "Breakthrough to Literacy," a linguistics scheme for teaching children to read and write at the same time, or "The Ladybird series," or perhaps several such series may be available. Picture books and story books in racks surround the reading area.

Similarly, the maths area will contain balances, weights, a variety of rules, number grids and boxes, unifex cubes, and Cuisinaire rods ——the widest possible assortment of apparatus from which to teach math. There will be teacher-made work cards and problem displays and a bulletin board filled with graphs. Children in an integrated day situation seem to be forever graphing ——feet sizes, chickens' eggs, birthdates and ages, heights and weights, and whatnot. Anything seems to be fair game to be measured, weighed, counted, compared or contrasted on a graph, or computed for area or shape.

Somewhere in the room will be an area given over to science. The natural vegetation of the school yard and the neighborhood may be represented in a collection of leaves, each displayed, identified and classified or there may be a display of soil samples, or a rock display, or a fossil collection, and nearby one is likely to find a cage or two with animals ——gerbils, guinea pigs, chickens, kittens, and so on. A terrarium, a fish tank, an ant house ——these too may be in the science area. Somewhere in this area [illegible]

may be an old automobile engine, partly disassembled, or a discarded television set, rendered safe, and the children may be continuing the dis-assembly, using the materials for other projects. The springs, the cranks, the pistons may be related to other machines, or to a study of simple machines. The television set provides a wealth of materials, as Keith Gordon, an Oxfordshire Curriculum Development Leader, notes in a memorandum prepared for Oxfordshire teachers and distributed from his Witney Teachers Centre.[18] He says that a TV set may provide wire for ductility studies, materials for analysis of various properties such as resiliency, conductability, hardness and softness, weight, and for such qualities as shape, density, texture and so on. The range of possibilities of using "junk" instructionally or educationally is apparently unlimited.

There will be an area for art and work begun in one of the other areas may come to find expression in some art form. A writing area may be nearby, a place where compositions may be prepared and where handwriting is taught. In Oxfordshire it is common to see the children learning to write in the Italic style and great stress is placed on the form as well as the content of compositions.

There may be a drama alcove or portion of a room, a place a few children at a time, using the simplest of props, play out dramas spontaneously, expressively using language, body movements,

gestures, and portraying an inexhaustible array of characters and situations which are the people and the concerns of their imaginations. Many of these extemporized dramas become the subjects of compositions or poems.

Another portion of the room may be given over to a sink and stove, a place where children cook simple dishes. The pricing of foods, the weighing of ingredients, the timing of cooking become another part of a math lesson while the reading and following directions of children's receipts extends the reading work. Even the smallest child has an opportunity to work here. There are many variations on the descriptions given here. No single description can reveal the varieties of room opportunities to be found in open education schools for children. All have areas for the basics —reading, writing, maths, science— all have an art area. Some have Wendy Houses, a doll house corner as it were, where additional opportunities are present to play out imaginary —and not so imaginary — roles and life situations. It is also common to find a Withdrawing area, a quiet spot to which a child can repair to rest, to stretch out, to be alone, to hang outside the activities and observe and contemplate.

It is a basic tenet of open, integrated day education that the child will make his curriculum for the environment about him. There is, in terms of the development of intellectual processes, no priority distinction to be drawn between work and play.

As Susanna Millar notes in discussing Piaget's principles of assimilation and accommodation, and their relation to intellectual processes, "Play and imitation are an integral part of the development of intelligence. . ." The teacher withstands the temptation to break into play to turn it into productive work since she realizes that through play the child may be engaging in "the repetition of an activity in order to understand it."[18] "Productive work," then, is seen as being an integral part of the involvement which children have with things in their environment. Thus, it becomes crucial for the teacher to provide the richest possible environment for children by selecting those things for the various areas of the room which she, out of training and experience, out of the guidance of Advisory Teachers and Heads, may count on to attract and ensnare the interests, the curiosities of children. Additionally, wise and sensitive teachers will extend the educational environment beyond the schoolroom to include other portions of the building, and to include the grounds itself. Forays into the countryside, and field trips, become significant experiences with the world beyond the classroom.

Some open educators seem to draw a distinction between natural and artificial environmental experiences from which children may learn, the natural seemingly more highly regarded than the artificial. Educational hardware and equipment, films and visual aids, mechanical learning aids and educational games,

packaged materials or kits of materials prepared on a given subject or theme, records, or maps of geographical areas — especially political-geographical maps— are regarded as being too structured, taking too much from the children or doing too much for them, or by being abstractions of reality rather than reality. Much more serious attention is paid to providing teachers and children with the materials from which they may construct the learning aids as they need. Heads (principals) commonly expend three-fifths of their total annual educational budget for teaching supplies - raw materials rather than published or prepared kits. A teacher who prepares a learning set-up for a child does it with a specific child in mind, not a subject matter to be learned, and thus the material teaches as the child works with it. It is this constant emphasis on the child and his learning that is so marked a part of the integrated day and the integrated curriculum.

Since each child is, in this educational milieu, quite literally his own curriculum-maker, setting the pace of his own achievements according to his own natural rhythms, his own individuality and stage of growth, there can be no failure. A consequence of this position is that threats and punishments have no place in open, integrated day education. Indeed, in some respects, mistakes, failures, errors are, if not courted, at least accepted readily as part of the learning process, since it is believed that children working with tangible pieces of evidence

can reconstruct a process ("mess around," or "play") and manipulate a set of materials until understanding is achieved. A child has the opportunity to correct his mistakes, to watch other children and take cues from them, and to advance his learning with confidence that, indeed, he does know something, not just the words for it. Learning, then, has as a part of its meaning the mastery of an operation, to which the child applies his words and which is then enlarged further by the growth to a greater verbal structure to represent an understood reality.

Free to move from area to area, the child follows his interests and comes to be involved with some aspect of his surroundings, some element introduced by the teacher. It is here that he begins. The teacher now plays an exceedingly subtle role, one requiring high integrity and professional sensitivity. She cannot use her adult presence as an authority figure to coerce the child into a project or an undertaking to which he feels no commitment, nor can she cajole him into expressing interest where none truly exists. She is further hampered from behaving in the traditional teacher role since she knows that she must enter his world, the world of his verbal constructs and not simply rely on the adult's verbal abstractions, too difficult for meaningful childhood understanding. She may not know of Piaget, but she would appreciate his remarks as when he says:

> The important thing is not to teach modern mathematics with ancient methods. . . . .
> As for teaching children concepts that they have not attained in their spontaneous development, it is completely useless. . . .
> . . . . . .
> You cannot teach concepts verbally; you must use a method founded on activity.[19]

The opportunity for such learning to take place is greatly inhibited if a child is pressurized; that is, if a child is put in a position in which he is expected to accomplish, in a set amount of time, a particular objective, the conditions needed for learning may be so impaired as to make his achievement faulty or impossible. In such a situation, the child may come to render to the teacher the proper words which we believe should be used by one who understands but which, in fact, may have very little to do with what the child has actually learned. Such verbally facile children may, indeed, appear to be among the brightest in classes. The apparent successes of the verbally facile child may come to structure the reward system in the classroom and an unfortunate competition ensues as children struggle to obtain personal recognition of their worthiness in a reward system having little to do with real learning. Indeed, from the point of view of open educators, teachers may come to apply all sorts of threats, punishments, rewards, invidious comparisons, insincere cajolery, or praise, or exasperated sarcasm or abuse to elicit performance from pupils. Open educators note that, in these circumstances, teachers may be faced with the need to maintain "control" and to "discipline" children, neither words nor acts much a part of the open educator's classroom life.

To open educators teaching in the integrated day circumstance, there isn't a sense of hurry and therefore there isn't a sense of frustration. The inner discipline that children need emerges slowly out of allowing children time to discover and work with materials in a disciplined way. A child working at the easel with paint and brush may need to spend hours just applying paint, stroking it on, watching it swirl and trace across the paper, watching a single color take on different hues ——experiencing the sensation and involvement of the act of painting as much as the reward of completing a painting. The open educator places great emphasis on allowing children the time to become involved, to experience process. Indeed, it may be that the process of becoming involved and of sustaining involvement is ultimately more important than the product that results, since it is the process which is transferable and it is the process which is a manifestation of inner discipline.

The integrated curriculum, then, is not just an environment rich in opportunities for children to explore. It is also a set of premises about how children should work, how teachers should work with them, and it is also a point of view toward knowledge itself. Fundamentally it is that any specific thing can be studied —can be the subject of involvement, for that to open educators is what "study" in the school sense means——and that such study can be broadened to encompass a wide variety of

specializations or disciplines. Children may come to see a leaf as a color, a botanical specimen, a geographical manifestation, a symbol, an artistic shape or form, a piece of natural history, and so on, but first and foremost for a child a leaf is a leaf, an object in nature. A child begins here. A sensitive teacher can use so slight a piece of a child's environment to stimulate inquiry and learning in all of the areas mentioned, and from such inquiry and study may flow processes of writing and painting, of reading and discussion, of poetry and drama, of movement and dance —all processes of creation and imagination. A teacher may intervene in these processes to give direction, to facilitate or encourage progression, and to help the child reach standards of achievement which the child does not realize as attainable. If, for instance, the child writes a lovely poem of a visit to a beach, it is the teacher who helps the child bring the final product to excellence. The poem may be written in a lovely Italic hand, illustrated by the child, framed and mounted with its illustration, and appropriately displayed. Moreover, the working through of this project may absorb all of the child's time. Her attention span is not thought of as being short, necessitating hops from subject to subject so that variety will substitute for involvement. The teacher, freed from having to teach all children the same lesson at the same time, can let the girl go free, can let her work on her own, let her share with others her thoughts and her problems as she works out her project. [illegible]

devoting attention to other children, singly and in groups, and can return to her when needed, perhaps to suggest that she move out from her preoccupation with the poem into stories and poems about the sea, and on to other projects in other areas. Sensitively and intelligently, the teacher will see that each child weaves together experiences from the environment which, in totality, comprise the subject substance one would recognize, in part at least, in the more traditional schoolroom.

There will be direct teaching, a time when a teacher sees that a child does, indeed, work at reading and writing; times when, with a small group of children, she will work with word building, with spelling, with word recognition, and with writing. Similarly, there will be times when she joins an individual or a small group at the maths area, there to work with the children on the understanding of basic computational skills and numeration. Periods such as these represent moments of consolidation of information and extension of interests and probings for children, in which the teacher plays a part. They are also valuable opportunities for teachers to evaluate the progress of individual pupils.

It is sometimes alleged that open education is permissive education, that the children are ill-managed, uncontrolled, noisy, and without regard for each other, the teacher, or for learning. It should be noted that there are good open education situations and poor open education situations, just as there are good and poor formal educational situations. However, observers

note that, even in the poorest open educational situation, children still enjoy the warmth of close personal relationships and the unthreatened opportunity for personal growth. These situations are not positively harmful as is not infrequently true of some poor formal educational situations.

Like any grass roots movement which had, as it origin, the classroom and the work of teachers; long standing influence of Dewey and Froebel and Montessori and the progressive movement played an indirect and off-stage part, this open education movement has now found its philosopher-theorist-scientist in Jean Piaget and his work in developmental psychology. His work and the commentaries on it have become the sanctions for what many are now doing in the name of open, integrated day education. Open, integrated day education has had a long, slow development in England, an evolution which first came to full flower in the British infant school. Stewart Mason recalls the "firsts" which may be attributed to the infant schools, a facet of open, integration education.

> The infant schools have led the way in most of the revolutionary reforms in method and approach which have been taking place since the war. They were the first to unstream, the first to break away from formality, the first to regard the individual child as the unit of learning instead of the class, the first to explore the possibility of learning through discovery instead of by rote, the first to regard genuine expression as more important than correct expression, the first to give adequate weight to the intuitive and the emotional sides or our nature, the first to explore the possibilities as a matter of policy of 'parental' or 'family' grouping

THIS PAGE WAS MISSING FROM THE DOCUMENT
THAT WAS SUBMITTED BY THE CLEARINGHOUSE.

III

> There can be no doubt of the importance or the exacting nature of the teacher's task. On the teachers, on their skills and on their good will, far more than on organisation or on buildings, the future of education depends.
>
> ——The Plowden Report, #878

The significant innovations in British primary education had their origins in the peoneering work of teachers who, out of the need they perceived to improve educational opportunities for children, brought about changes in school organization and in curriculum. These changes have come to be called in these later days, "open, integrated day" education, but, for most of its developmental history, this innovative movement had no set or clear label or name. Moreover, only recently have the component parts come to be seen as something of a whole. The cautionary word "something" should be noted because there is still present a wide range of views and interpretations about the nature of open, integrated day education. There is no doubt, however, that open education is a teachers' movement, one stemming from the

work of teachers who had been formally trained themselves and who, in most instances, had experience in formal teaching.

Many of these teachers and those who came to teaching in the immediate post-war years experienced the impact of the 1939 War upon education and upon children. These veteran teachers testify to the upheaval English schools and children went through. Children were evacuated from urban areas. School buildings in safe reception cities and towns absorbed the evacuated children, one school coming to house as many as two and three school enrollments. Make-shift hours, make-shift quarters, books and materials provided for one school stretched to provide for two and three, parents and unqualified personnel pressed into teaching and supervisory service ——all these and many more such experiences brought the education of young children to the forefront and led many to question the basic assumptions which had underlain much of British education.[1] One cannot overlook too the fact that many English educators were determined that better conditions should prevail for children than had existed before, a sense that one of the sweeter fruits of the war's bitter years should be an improved life for the children who, after all, represented the future for which all had so valiantly striven at such great cost. Thus teachers, many of whom went on to be head teachers, developed slowly the practices which have so recently come to be called open, integrated day education. As the Murrow's state in their excell-

ent book, Children Come First:

> The war had a tremendous effect on primary schools throughout England. Children were forced to move from the cities to the safer rural area. With village schools overcrowded and everything in short supply, improvisation was essential. Infant-school teachers who were working at the time cite the war's influence on their teaching as far greater than that of any theoretician.[2]

According to John Coe, four areas in England have made particularly noteworthy strides in developing open education during the decades since the war: The West Riding of Yourshire, the city of Bristol, Leicestershire, and Oxfordshire. In each of these locations, there was a particularly influential individual and a group of teachers and head teachers around him who became the nucleus of change, those who gave direction and support to the movement to free education from the constraints of the past. In Yorkshire, Sir Alec Clegg is the man to whom John Coe attributes the greatest influence. As Coe says, he is the man who, though heading the administration,

> is likely to be found with a great pile of papers on his desk delegated to someone else while he is out with some children on the playground. . . Now he undoubtedly played a big part when he gathered people around him who would play a big part in pushing the changes forward in the West Riding of Yourshire, in sometimes the most unpromising circumstances ——under-privileged children, heavy industry, back-to-back housing, dirt, squalor, lack of opportunity, and yet there's marvelous work there.[3]

In a like manner, Leicestershire has had Stewart Mason as chief education officer. He and those around him have constituted a powerful force for change. Similarly, wherever one looks to find change in British primary education, one finds an informal team of teachers and heads, advisers and administrative officers who, working out of the strengths of teachers in the schools, have slowly brought to over one-third of the maintained primary schools the open, integrated day mode of education. One must constantly bear in mind that the heart of this British educational innovation has been the classroom teacher, and that it has been the strengths of the classroom teacher which has sustained and carried forward the innovative developments. As Coe says,.

> We don't work by saying to people, 'You've been wholly wrong for twenty or thirty years because seldom is that so. If the work is a little old-fashioned, out-dated, meaningless to children, over-academic, all right. But we take what strengths are there. There will be strengths.[4]

In talking with these British educational leaders, one soon senses that people count ——who they are, what they are, what their concerns are ——these really matter, and that people can be worked with and can be brought on. One mustn't romanticize this: beneath the glowing descriptive words these men use to express their attitudes and their work, one can also sense that there have been some real battles, some deep internecine struggles. The head who tells you that, "You're seeing us now that things are all right," and who alludes to the unhappiness of previous years, speaks volumes

too. Yet granting th[illegible]ll has not always moved smoothly, the degree of concern which professional people express for each other, and the degree of concern and attention expressed and demonstrated toward children is truly inpressive and remarkable. As Oxford University's George Perry notes, the concern for human relations training is marked among those who are engaged in innovative developments.[5]

If bringing people along, working with them to develop the strengths they possess even more fully is one way of bringing change to schools, then indeed it must also be acknowledged that staff attrition also plays a part, particularly when the opportunity to replace head teachers occurs. Six of the seven head teachers leaving service this year in Oxfordshire will be replaced by professionals who themselves have demonstrated teaching excellence in the open education mode. There will be changes in these schools which have not as yet moved forward significantly toward open education. As Coe says,

> I know six of their replacements very well, indeed. I've watched their work in other counties or in this county and I know, beyond a doubt, that there will be major changes in a child-centered direction made in those schools in the next two or three years. It can't happen immediately. I will counsel, and I have counselled those new head teachers to appraise their schools, to understand the strengths and the convictions of the people in them, and to provide leadership of the kind which will be welcome, accepted by teachers in those schools. . . . . .
> . . . . . .
> I will counsel those new head teachers to build on the strengths which are there and go forward in an evolutionary way out of what was there with the previous head teacher. But there will be changes.

Changes there will be ---educators everywhere acknowledge that in some degree, in some manner, schools and the work of teachers will change. Observers as well as the teachers themselves are agreed that open education, integrated day teaching is more difficult than traditional teaching. Traditional teachers have a base of security and predictability in their work quite unknown to those who work in the open education, integrated day mode. As Bob Horth notes;

> It will be seen that the demands made on a teacher in this type of organization are almost fantastic, for he has to provide carefully planned individual and group experiences in play, art, craft, movement, music etc. The teacher has, I think, a much greater degree of responsibility than his counterpart in a more authoritarian type of school, and he cannot afford to pay mere lip service to the individual.[7]

The Plowden Report underscores this same point:

> The teacher who used to give set lessons could manage on a little knowledge and use it over and over again. Far more knowledge, both about subject matter and about how children learn, is called for in teachers who have continually to exercise judgment, to "think of their feet", to keep in mind long term and short term objectives.[8]

Certainly the traditional teacher seems to be in a different position than the open education teacher. If one doesn't characterize the latter too much, such a teacher seems to be in the act of constant curriculum development, making instant mini-curriculum for this child and a different one for that, seems to be a person constantly in motion, addressing words of encouragement and help to one child

while another is about to tug at the teacher for attention. How a teacher maintains a supply of patience, an inexhaustibly fresh supply of ideas and comments, and still has time to prepare rooms, attend meetings, go off to in-service courses, meet parents, and carry on a normal adult social and intellectual life too is something of a puzzle, a marvelous wonder. Yet this kind of teacher is now at work in schools in Oxfordshire. They are neither unusual or different, nor are they all bright young certificate holders or graduates. Many of these teachers do come close to Arthur Razzell's description:

> Without exception, the many teachers I know who are suceeding in working at this higher level with boys and girls have themselves high personal standards. . . . They are invariably well read, they know much of the literature about the primary school and have opinions about what has been written. Despite the fact that teaching is probably at its most demanding with lively youngsters in this age bracket, these teachers still find time to attend courses and discussion groups, and they are aware of what is happening in many other schools. They are not isolates. Their classrooms have the ordered untidiness of a busy workshop, but this never sinks to the level of the depressing untidiness that can sometimes be seen in junior classrooms. . . .[9]

If these changes require the kind of personal growth, if not transformation, which is suggested here, then there must be instrumentalities, there must be personnel who can aid in facilitating this kind of change. For the most part, the teachers who are described here as the open educators —the new breed of teachers— are not being produced by the teacher training colleges.

When it comes to replacing retiring teachers or to hiring teachers for a new school or an expanding school, Oxfordshire heads and advisers must rely, for the most part, on colleges which have not kept pace with the developments in the schools. Since colleges of education must supply teachers to a wide variety of schools, formal and informal, private as well as tax maintained, they have not been as free to develop training programs as they might have been if education in Britain were less diversified in character. Moreover, colleges of education have had to expand at a great rate during the past decade and merely accommodating the increased enrollments, finding enough new and qualified lecturers, and developing the facilities has been a major pre-occupation in itself. Thus, it is scarcely possible for a local educational authority to hope to be able to staff its schools with certificate holders or degree graduates who themselves have been trained in the ways of open education. Indeed, probationary teachers —first year teachers undergoing evaluative scrutiny before achieving permanent status— complain frequently about their college training. In a book ostensibly addressed to the James Committee, a committee appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and headed by Lord James to undertake a short inquiry into teacher education, it is noted:

> To put it badly, there are three main complaints about teacher training as it now exists. The first is that in social terms it is a failure. We know that the students in college of education, like students in universities, are socially homogeneous. They come, on the whole, from middle-class families
> . . . . . .

> The second complaint about teacher education is that it is academic and remote from reality. . . Many young teachers find, not that their ideas are inappropriate, but that their training has ignored some of the most obvious practical skills which a teacher needs ——like how to achieve order in a difficult school . . . . . .
> . . . . . .
> . . . the third major complaint about teacher education . . .——that it lacks rigor. It is not just that the failure rate is suspiciously low, not just that student teachers find themselves covering similar ground to that which they tramped over at A-level, not just that some of the practical work is often appropriate for seven year olds. It is that the course as a whole offers too little intellectual challenge.[10]

Criticism of teacher education and preparation is common-place, both in the United States and in England. Much of the content of the criticism, apart from its emotionalism, is the same: a general denigration of the professional course work, especially philosophy of education; a charge that much of the methods work is irrelevant to what goes on in the schools, generally not very helpful; and the repeated expression that there is not good practical experience of long enough duration under competent supervisory help with children in schools. As one English probationary teacher said, "Well, if you get a good tutor, you're well away, but, if you get one that's been doin' it for a bit too long and they're (sic) a bit tired and they want to get out and do something else, you can come rather unstuck."[11] The Oxfordshire authorities do, indeed, try to find young people who won't "come rather unstuck." Several teacher training institutions are regularly tapped by Oxfordshire, among them are Goldsmiths College in London, The City of Coventry College, Stockwell College in Kent,

St. John's College in York, and Newton Park College near Bath. As Coe says, "These colleges are certainly well in the mainstream of current practice."

Of course, what has happened in Britain is that actual school practice in innovative schools has outrun the work of the colleges of education and no doubt will continue to do so. Teacher education and preparation are coming to be seen in a somewhat different light. Upon completion of formal college work and in-school practice teaching, a certified new teacher is ready to undertake the fulfillment of a position in which she can continue to learn, can finally develop her style, and can grow to be a teacher of knowledge and skill, of firmness and flexibility, capable of an individual contribution as well as team work. Head teachers and advisory teachers are important to the newcomers growth and development. Education and training programs prepare one for what are in effect on-the-job finishing programs. However, nowdays a new teacher and the older or more experienced colleagues she joins on a school staff are never, in the limited sense of the word, "finished." Like all other aspects of modern life, education is changing and open education is far from a finished educational mode ——its development continues. It is this continuous onward rush of change in all education and in open education that makes the change agent role of the head teacher and the advisory teacher so vitally important.

It is customary for Americans to think of head teachers as they do American school principals. Indeed, head teachers do fulfill the role of principal. They are in charge of the building, its staff, it maintenance, its materials, equipment, and supplies. They are responsible for the budget expenditures allotted to their building. Theirs is the task of assigning teachers and pupils, of maintaining cordial relations with the community and with the central office. Indeed, a head teacher has many burdensome administrative duties which he cannot neglect. Yet he is selected for his position, not because of administrative ability, but because he is the best teacher around. As John Coe remarks:

> If we look at the head teacher in our system, indeed yes, he is an administrator. He is at the head of the team which is concerned with the functioning of that school as an administrative as well as a teaching unit. He is appointed to be that. We chose our best teachers . . . to be principals. He may or may not be a good administrator. Therefore, in this authority ——it's not true in every authority——our clear priority with regards to the head teacher's role lies in the direction of him teaching.[12]

Coe goes on to say most clearly,

> We are not so concerned with his administrative abilities. We would not want him to conceive of his role as largely administrative. If he felt he was not so secure in that role, we would attempt to support him in the school with other administrative personnel. Primarily we want him in the school as a dynamic for learning, for new approaches to learning. He is the inspirer, the leader, in the teaching sense, and in our system which places great stress on the independence of the head teacher, the teaching role is paramount.[13]

An Oxfordshire head teacher is an authority to behold. From an American's point of view, he is indeed a rara avis. Like the captain of a ship, he commands as much by presence as by word. He emanates control, self-assurance, and decisiveness. One senses immediately that the school he is in is, indeed, the head's school and that its character is his character. The philosophy of education, the attitude toward subject matter and to content, the attitudes toward children reflect his philosophy and his attitudes. One may say that much of this is true of an American principal too, but the difference between the American principal and his school and the English head teacher and his school is pronounced. The English head enjoys a far greater autonomy than does the American principal. Our schools tend to become system schools, one like another with variations from school to school intentionally muted. English schools are individual. There is no attempt made to formalize a system unity. The head is given a school and a staff to shape into the best possible instrumentality of education for children. How he does that is his business. It should be noted that, generally speaking, an English head runs a smaller school than does his American counterpart, and much of the 'administrivia' which concerns an American principal is removed from the English head's shoulder, if one will allow such an expression. Central purchasing, for example, may greatly simplify the acquisition of materials and supplies.

THIS PAGE WAS MISSING FROM THE DOCUMENT
THAT WAS SUBMITTED BY THE CLEARINGHOUSE.

> 929. The independence of the head teacher within his school is great. The intervention of local authority or managers in the curriculum and organization is no more than nominal. It is for the head teacher in co-operation with the staff to crystallise the school's aims and to see that schemes and organization serve them. The head teacher must know the staff, both the teachers and others, be aware of their gifts and weaknesses and assign their duties in such a way that children are well taught. It is also the head teacher's responsibility to ensure that the staff are provided with essential equipment and are kept in touch with new ideas.
>
> 930. It is rare to find a primary school so large that the head teacher cannot know every child, which is particularly valuable at this time of rapid turnover of assistant teachers. The best way to get to know children is to teach them, and be with them inside and outside the classroom. In this way a good head teacher can stimulate the children, inspire the staff, weld the school into a unity and set its values. If there are areas of the curriculum which other teachers cannot effectively cover the head teacher will have to equip himself as far as possible to deal with them.
>
> 931. . . . . .
> . . . . . .There is no better way of commending their leadership to the staff than by demonstrating their skill in the classroom. The fact that the head continues to teach raises the whole status of teaching.[14]

If we return then to the thesis that teacher training programs are falling short of excellence, and if we again note that all teachers need to continue their growth, and if we re-assert the fundamental primacy of the Head Teacher's teaching role, we have no doubt that the matter of staff development, of probationary teacher supervision and development of educational leadership falls squarely on the shoulders of the Head Teacher. The Plowden Report says as much

and it confirms the impressions that most visitors to British schools quickly gather. Ultimately, in any school, the value of what is done is in the hands of classroom teachers. Their directions and inspiration, the working conditions and opportunities for growth come from the ability of the head teacher to create favorable and supportive situations. In this connection, we may examine how two young teachers are developing their professional competence and their service to a school and its children.

John and Mary Britton* are a husband and wife team who teach juniors, ages seven to eleven, in an Oxfordshire junior school. Young and attractive, Mr. and Mrs. Britton work together with a combined class of sixty-six children. Their classroom is a large, sunny room off the central library. An anteroom is off each end of the central room. While one has the feeling of being crowded in among a profusion of furniture, display areas for maths and science, art and sewing, a portable blackboard, an old automobile engine, and a myriad of other attractive or interesting items, all with knots of children clustered about, some seated on the floor sewing, others doing maths at a table, others making their own books in attractive italic handwriting, one is impressed with the purposefulness of it all. The children are working. There is no lack of discipline. The conversations hum along but no one is distracted. John Britton is hard to find when one enters the room until one notices him seated with a small group of children, working with them on maths. Mary Britton is in the left anteroom, working with [illegible]

*The names are fictitious in this account.

teachers have the help of an aide, and the aide is over in a corner helping some girls sew a cloth collage. Children enter and leave the room as they need. The atmosphere in the room is one of friendliness, warmth, purpose, and quite unlike what one thinks of a classroom as being like. During a break in the morning, John and Mary tell about themselves.

John is a university graduate having taking a degree in philosophy. Mary graduated from another college as an art major, certified to teach. John took a post-graduate year at Coldsmiths College in London where, he says, the tutors are school men on leave who give practical courses in teaching. His tutor was an Oxfordshire head teacher. It was upon completion of his graduate work that John was encouraged to move to Oxford for employment. When asked why a university philosophy degree major would take up teaching in a junior school, his reply is direct and simple. It's where things are happening and where one can count. The added fact that both he and his wife can teach together in the same school provided an added inducement.

Both John and Mary Britton have taken every opportunity for growth that has come to them. There are, they tell, courses which are called "ministry courses" and courses offered through the LEA (Local Education Authority), both in-service courses. The ministry courses frequently occur on holiday times or bridging a holiday time and running into school time. One applies to the Department of Education and Science in London and pays the fee and

attends. Positions in these courses are much sought after, the competition keen, and not all who apply can go. The courses may be several weeks in length and be sited at some residential location several hundred miles away from one's home school area. One of the great benefits of going on a ministry course, they say, is that those who attend represent a cross-role grouping ---participants being of every role from probationer through to Her Majesty's Inspectors, the H.M.I.'s, the five hundred men who are appointed to "inspect" the nation's school on behalf of the Department of Education and Science and the Secretary of State for Education. Local in-service courses, generally arranged by and taught by Advisory Teachers of the Local Education Authority, are commonly --almost exclusively after-school or evening courses. Occasionally a weekend course is arranged. Local education authority courses are going on most of the time. John and Mary attend as many of these in-services courses as they can, but they find the cost of travel and the cost of tuition hard to bear. John notes that he has spent over £40.* on courses this year alone. One need note that there is no advance on a salary schedule nor other form of professional reward for attending such work-shops. The local authority workshops run by advisers are, of course, free.

John and Mary Britton have attended ministry courses in Mathematics organized by the Department of Education and Science and held over a ten day period at Reading, and they have also

*£ is used herein as symbol for British pound.

attended a week long course in Environmental Studies, at Greenwich, which involved the integration of math, science and art. They've also taken part in a short course in Open Plan Teaching, and several local education authority courses, one in English Language and Poetry, one in Arts and Crafts, and courses in Physical Education and in Music.

If John and Mary Britton are typical——and one may guess that they are not——then working with teachers, bringing them along, effecting change is not something left to the colleges, nor handled solely by the head teachers in their schools, but is, indeed, a part of a larger educational scene: that of an elaborate in-service education thrust at both the national and the local educational authority level. When John and Mary Britton were asked what addition could be made to the professional life, most valuable to them, were money no bar, they both replied,". . . a teacher center." Like pieces of a puzzle falling together, the teacher center growth has come on England strongly in the last decade, and especially in the last few years. It becomes a visible manifestation of the changes taking place in education in England, and it is, indeed, a major agency in of change itself. The in-service courses and the teacher centers form a means of continuously renewing and sustaining teachers at a time of maximum change in school organization and curriculum development. The teacher center, especially, becomes an important linkage in the levels of educational enterprise concerned with change ——the Department of Education and Science, the National Schools Council, the teachers' colleges, the local education authorities, and the schools themselves.

IV

When you don't know where you're going,
all roads will take you there.
—An Old Saying

The Advisory Service

For many teachers in England there are uncharted paths to open education. How does one teach science without a set of texts, without a standard curriculum guide? How does one teach reading to children of differing ages and abilities, all mixed up together? How does one, not skilled in physical education or movement, teach physical education or movement to children? How does one who possesses no particular skill or knowledge of arts and crafts become acquainted enough with these to be able to teach them to children and to make use of them in some interdisciplinary manner? Indeed, things were simpler when each subject had its time segment and its own set of texts, relatively unchanging from year to year. Now in open education, how does a teacher know enough to be responsible for all curriculum areas in primary grades and cast those subject areas into a constant progression of activities, largely drawn from the immediate

environment? The questions are endless and the problems large, but it may be said that they are reduced in number and size initially by two factors we previously mentioned and need only recall here. First, the presence of a teaching head teacher —one who has expreienced success in the open education situation and who can give leadership to a school is part of the answer. A second part lies in the provisions made for team teaching. A teaching team can bring together many minds on the educational problems presented by the open classroom and each member of the team may have special talents or knowledge or abilities to give to a group of shared pupils. Thus, it may not be necessary for every member of the team to be well versed in every curriculum area. With openness —children being able to go from one area of the building to another without hindrance—the talents of many persons are on call. There's little sense to team teaching if children are not completely free to move from area to area, from person to person, at will. A third factor, one frequently overlooked, is that the pace of learning is greatly changed. Since it is no longer necessary for all pupils to be at the same place at the same time, and since a normative scale of achievement used to guage pass and fail is no longer feasible, both teachers and pupils can slow down, get away from the notion of coverage, focus on the process of learning itself, and take the time to do well the educative enterprise at hand. How a thing is done may become as important as what it is that is done, pro- -ess . ..cipline is as important

as product with excellence.

In such a situation as we've described, British educators note that the closed doors, the squirreling away of supplies, the mutual suspicisions which may come between teachers, the predominant concern for control and discipline, the necessity to grade pupils from failure to excellence is changed. The change represents a fundamental change of attitude toward learning and toward children. Without such a change open education is probably not possible. In such a situation as has been described then, the burden of responsibility for instruction, curriculum, and pupil achievement falls on the teacher, but with it goes trust in her ability to grow, faith in her accomplishments with children. But public or tax supported education cannot be left merely to acts of trust and faith, necessary as these are. Some agencies and agents must be present to assure that teachers manifest classroom excellence and continue to grow. An advisory service is clearly a most necessary part of the growth, the continuance, and the innovative capacity of the open education mode.

Some local educational authorities maintain an advisory service, a man or a body of men who have been successful teachers and frequently successful head teachers. These men are entrusted with the improvement of instruction and the development of curriculum within their system. They are not administrators, except in the most limited sense. They are teachers who visit schools, who

a the solution to problems, and who also visit and work with eachers in schools in the area assigned to them. At the primary evel, these advisory teachers are generalists, men who by virtue f training and long experience can be helpful to teachers in most f the curriculum areas common to primary schools. These advisory eachers may have a specialty and it may be this specialty which erves them in good stead at the secondary level or in the workshops hich they conduct for teachers. In Oxfordshire, there is an dvisory service, headed by Mr. John Coe as Senior Advisor. As ohn Coe says,

> I run the advisory team in Oxfordshire. I have a team of six advisors in primary schools, some in secondary schools too. My role takes me into primary and secondary schools and I think that is important, otherwise good work with younger children is disipated when they go through to the next school.[1]

Clearly, a major responsibility of the advisory service then is developing an orderly progression to learning in the primary schools and in seeing that orderly progression maintained into the secondary school. One may sense the degree of anguish which occurs when children move from the open, integrated day primary school into a secondary school which is still formal or traditional. The problem is highlighted by a letter from a reader published in the Schools Council magazine, Dialogue: -

> In my school, as in a good many enlighted Primary Schools, all work is individual. This enables the brighter children to do advanced work which would have been thought beyond the capabilities

> However, at the age of eleven, with transfer to Secondary Schools, comes the great problem. Individual work ceases. Children are either streamed, or put into ability sets, but even with the smaller classes in Secondary Schools, each child is different.
>
> I find that many of the children leaving my school who are keen and enthusiastic about the subject, have their interest killed completely by this class approach.
>
> As I see it, the great problem facing all is not traditional versus modern. . . but a continuity between Primary and Secondary teaching.(Emphasis added)[2]

Coe, with his roving brief as Senior Advisor, aided by his fellow advisers may have eased the strain of articulation in Oxfordshire more than elsewhere, but the problem remains as one to be coped with at all times, especially now that teacher transiency has become a factor in British education as it has in American education.

Mr. Coe expresses the work of the advisory team members rather well in the following quotation from my interview with him:

> . . . our 165 primarys are divided among the six of my team and myself. I have a roving brief so that I would go anywhere in the country among the 165, and each (of the other advisors) has between twenty-five and thirty-five schools. They work in and out of those schools, day by day, helping in a number of important ways. They teach. They're not primarily, as I am not primarily, administrators; they are fundamentally teachers and guides and encouragers. They would spend quite a short time in a school discussing how things are going with the principal, maybe discussing needs which the principal sees in his schools; perhaps suggesting developments in the work, maybe actually going into the classroom, working alongside the teachers in developing such work. They don't go in to

> replace the teachers; they go in to work alongside them. Of course, they are very much responsible for in-service training, [illegible] for the re-training of us all, in the area. In that sense, they are communicators. They bring schools together . . .[3]

One of Coe's team members is Richard Vines. Mr. Vines, like s five adviser colleagues, has the responsibility for visiting d being adviser to thirty-three Oxfordshire schools. Some achers know very little of him or his work, but a surprisingly rge number have heard of him and have called upon his services. s leadership of in-service workshops has put him in touch with ny Oxfordshire teachers, both those in his district and those om other areas of the county. Of his role, Mr. Vine says:

> My advisory role covers all the curriculum areas which one would expect to find in the primary schools but, of course, each of us —and I myself— would lay claim to an interest in one or two aspects of the curriculum which I would personally hold more dear than others because of my natural bent in that direction which, it happens, to be an artistic one.[4]

Richard Vines, like his fellow advisers, regularly gives ıort, practical in-service courses for teachers. These are ganized through Coe's office, publicized to the schools, and rough the head teachers, and given in one of the primary schools ı Oxfordshire, commonly after school hours or sometimes in the enings. Vines gives courses in art and craft work, practical nds-on class experience, the teachers doing what it is that ey will be having children do. Not infrequently parents may tend and take part in the course work too and, to the degree at this is done, the school's public relations are improved.

These short courses go on all the time, in almost all the subject areas. There has been a notable spread of the Nuffield math program and the Nuffield science program through the work of in-service courses and the help of the advisory teachers. Generally, attendance and participation in such workshops is voluntary, but it is common that the enrollment is really larger than an advisory teacher is able to handle well, especially in the field of arts and crafts.

If head teachers are given the freedom to shape their schools as they will, developing for each school its own individuality in program and organization, then it is to the advisory service that we must look for the uniformity or standardization that may occur in program design and implementation. Without imposing a curriculum on a school and on teachers, the advisory team, working together and sharing a common philosophy and approach, can work to improve the skills of teachers, and can draw from teachers materials and methods which have proved to be successful and spread these through the workshops to other teachers in other schools. Additionally, the advisory teachers, by virtue of being somewhat more free to attend ministry workshops, can share with teachers in their district the results of curriculum developments emanating from other sources. Clearly, the advisory service is the single most important element in a local innovative initiative. It is this service which interfaces one school and its endeavors with another, one school with research and development groups, and

which seeks to help the individual head teacher and his staff members improve on their own practices. It is highly significant that in each of the four pioneer areas of The West Riding of Yorkshire, Oxfordshire, Leicestershire, and Bristol where open, integrated day education has taken hold and flourished, there are strong advisory teams. Ultimately an advisory service is as strong as the support it receives from the Chief Education Officer of the local authority, a man in a position much like that of an American superintendent of schools. The advisory service becomes his means of bringing change to his schools. As the Murrows note,

> The advisory services which we have seen in active operation are immensely important to the success of the schools in their region. They provide services that could be dispensed in no other way. More importantly, they form a steady but informal link between the schools, which allows for a level of communication between teachers and head teachers that is unknown in areas where such a service does not exist. It is fair to say that counties that are famous for a large number of innovative schools are counties that have active and strong advisory services.[5]

The Plowden Report devotes a section to the advisory services, national and local, which may be worth citing at this juncture.

> 944. The roles of the national and local inspectorates are complementary. H.M. Inspectorate is a relatively mobile body which can watch the development of education in maintained and independent schools throughout the country. Advances in education or practice are often surprisingly local and often owe much to local inspectors and advisers. They can be made widely known by H.M. Inspectors.
>
> 945. Local inspectors (advisers) through courses, visits and placing of staff can help build up a group of outstanding schools which may serve as a spearhead of

> advance within their own authority and often in the country as a whole . . . . . .
>
> 946. . . . . .
> We have been much impressed by the work of advisory teachers who have a small group of schools, and who concentrate on help for teachers. What distinguishes them from other inspectors and advisers is that much of their time is spent in teaching in the classroom, often side by side with the class teacher.[6]

It is generally recognized that too few local education authorities have advisory services for their schools and teachers and that where these do exist the number of advisers is generally too few for adequate coverage of the schools in the authority. As the Plowden Report notes: "There should be additional inspectors or, even better, advisory teachers in primary and particularly infant education."[7] George Perry, in an interview at Oxford, added ". . . if you were to ask me as an outsider . . . I would say that our local advisory service, although they're local authority employees, —this is one of the strongest aspects of our educational system in terms of effecting and developing innovation."[8] Pressed to identify the main characteristic which seems to be a part of the advisers' make-up, Perry went on to say,

> Charismatic, I would think is one of the words you would use about them. They are chosen very carefully for this particular quality, if a quality it is. The other, of course, is that they are all successful practitioners. They are all eminentyly successful practitioners. . . They do, in fact, develop what Neil Gross in your country calls, 'Executive Professional Leadership.' They all have this to a very marked degree.[9]

Perry dwelt on the subject of the appointment of advisers, the care with which these men are chosen. He noted that, in many instances, they were men who had gained for themselves a reputation for excellence in their positions, who were regarded as fine teachers and innovators. Many of these men came to the attention of H.M.I.s —Her Majesty's Inspectors— who had opportunity to observe their teaching and their schools and who were thus able to commend them to teacher training institutions for leave-time tutor positions, or were able to direct them to the National Schools Council for work in curriculum development, and that, when the time came to recommend a man for the position of local adviser, there were a number of well placed educational professionals who could, quite informally, commend a number of likely candidates for an advisory position. The English seem to be quite willing to trust to this informal, Christian-name basis of commendation; at least, it seems to be so if Perry testifies accurately as to practice in general.

Her Majesty's Inspectors

H.M.I.s, as they are called, are the national counterpart of the local advisers. Approximately five hundred professional educators now fill these positions, each assigned to an area of the country and to the schools and training colleges in that area. There the H.M.I.s consult with educational leaders, visit colleges and schools, both hold and attend conferences, [illegible]

workshops in concert with others, and act in ways which will facilitate communication between various levels of school officials and of schools and encourage and help improvements come to British education. Once H.M.I.s had a more ominous role. They were Inspectors, indeed, visiting schools to conduct examinations of pupils. The results of these examinations were used to assess the amount to be paid the teachers, an early form of "accountability" which the British referred to as "payment by results". This part of the H.M.I.s role was terminated in 1898. Between the termination of this inspectorate role and the present era, as the Plowden Report notes, H.M.I.s were probably "restraining influences on innovation, though as time went on they tended increasingly to be agents of experiment and change.[10] By and large, H.M.I.s now fulfill a much larger role of change agent than at any previous time.

A body of national advisers, having the implicit authority of the Department of Education and Science behind them, not possessed however of actual authority of enforcement, tends to lend a very supportive arm to innovations undertaken by local authorities. Moreover, as the Plowden Report notes, locally developed but significant innovations may be readily diffused through the body of the H.M.I.s and thereby spread nationally within a relatively short time. To an outsider, the close and informal contacts between educators in England reminds one that the entire British system of

that these mutually supportive relationships between people in the Department of Education and Science, people in local authorities, people in colleges of education and in development projects can grow perhaps more readily than they can here. One also has to remind oneself that English schools in local authorities occupy a somewhat different position in relation to local political and economic circumstances —being less under the gun, as it were— than are our American schools. Nonetheless, having said this, there is need to say that relations between H.M.I.s and local advisers are not to be understood as being automatically congenial and understanding. As Coe says,

> On occasions, there are differences of view. . . Therefore, it's very important in our work to have very close links with interested people, like the local university, the area training organization who have a duty to provide course of re-training for our teachers. I have very close links also with our opposite numbers who work for the DES in London, the H.M.I.s . . . We work very hard at coordinating our policy because we don't want to put ourselves in the position of offering conflicting advice to schools. . . We would like to have common principles on which we work and I think we achieve those.'[1]

What we see emerging then is an intricate set of relationships between men in different roles, serving different organizations —as the local authority, the area teacher training college, the Department of Education and Science, the curriculum development project at a local or nearby college or university— but all or almost all knowing each other, reasonably aware of each other's philosophy and approach, and each helping and sustaining the other. Moreover,

there seems to be a consistent view among these men that it is the classroom teacher, indeed, who is the most important person on the educational scene and that ultimately their endeavors must serve to help her and her pupils. It is in this connection, then, that the H.M.I.s play such a vital role. As the Murrows state:

> The H.M.I.s in recent years have had a marked influence on the changes that have taken place in education. Although they are not primarily responsible for change, they can encourage it, and watch for problems. They can try to keep officials and teachers up to date on recent developments and can smooth over some difficulties that arise within local education authorities. It is a tribute to English thinking on education that a force of five hundred people can continue to act as observers without having a major vested interest or a solely administrative function within a system.[12]

The Museum Service

As teachers face the prospect of moving away from traditional education with its heavy reliance on textbooks, they come to need a range of services and supplies which previously were less needed. In each of the authorities which have made significant strides toward developing open, integrated day education, there has come to be a vital, expanding museum service. Oxfordshire's school museum service is located in the town of Woodstock. In reality, the school service is a relatively new function of the Oxford City and County Museum which maintains a static exhibit of indigenous artifacts. The museum's school service came into existence as recently as four years ago. It first operated with the services of one person and was funded at £300 per year. Its growth has been quite

This year the museum staff consisted of nine people and the budget had grown to L12,000. Today the staff consists of three education officers, one for art, one for history, and one for natural science. Additionally, there is a part-time secretary, three van drivers who move the school exhibits out of the museum to the schools and pick them up for return, and lastly, a technician, and a cleaning lady. The number of exhibits has now grown to approximately three thousand separate items, all catalogued in a red bound brouchure which is available in each school in Oxfordshire. The circulation rate of item is approximately two hundred fifty items a day moved out of the museum to schools in Oxfordshire.

One first becomes aware of the museum service when visiting an Oxfordshire school. The displays of lovely pottery or the displays of beautiful fabric or prints which backgrounds some ... children's work or a flower arrangement or merely gives color to a corner of an otherwise drab room ——these, one learns, came from the museum service. In classroom after classroom one sees stuffed animals, or large dolls in period costumes, or displays of art reproductions, or animal skeletons, or historical exhibits like a full reproduction of the Rosetta Stone or a Viking ship model or some other model or replica. Stacked away are the brilliant red boxes in which the materials or artifacts are transported and stored. When the museum van arrives at a primary school, the children gather around to see the red boxes unloaded and to [illegible] front panel to see what's inside. The museum [illegible] half dozen older boys to lug the red boxes in to the school ...

to bring out the ones being returned. Each fortnight the scene is replayed as new materials move in and out.

Miss Alison Cureton, Assistant Museum Education Officer for History, a member of the staff, comments on the work of the museum:

> We feel that it's absolutely essential that pupils work with these things, to be able to handle these things, to be able to touch them, feel the feathers of the bird, to feel the different oiliness of the feathers or the light featheriness which makes the owl fly so quietly or the duck swim so well. . . I think this is a tremendous experience for children.[13]

Of course, this is precisely why the museum service has grown so greatly in recent years, its growth a measure of the degree to which open, integrated day education has taken hold. Open, integrated day primary education certainly places a high degree of value on reality --on things in the natural world and on things which represent man and his accomplishments and on things which are beautiful as well. Because classrooms must provide a rich experiential base in a number of interest centers, the museum service is a rich treasure trove of artifacts which the teacher can draw on to provide a valuable take-off for a pupil's work.

The museum's collection is housed in a barrack-like building behind the main museum building. It is to this building that teachers send their requests for the red boxed artifacts. Once delivered, they are for teacher and pupil use for a two-week period. Commonly schools submit a year long standing order. Said materials may be ordered at any time on an "as available" basis

will be broken or lost. With the constant and growing use of artifacts and materials, and with a slight loss rate, the museum staff is continuously on the lookout for new acquisitions. As Miss Cureton says, "The objects are begged, borrowed, stolen, bought, or made especially for us."[14] She and her fellow staff members have become constant searchers for new pieces. Many acquisitions are made through other museums, especially through the British Museum in London. And Miss Cureton notes,

> We try to acquire things we know will be useful or things teachers have expressed a need for but obviously this depends on sources and availability, which are, of course,a tremendous problem, especially for historical objects.[15]

Noting how the museum service has come to be regarded by school people, Miss Cureton adds:

> I do feel, as one of the advisers said, that (our service) offers another dimension to teaching; it's something that, once you've had it, you wonder how you ever managed without it before . . . it's this thing about visual education rather than spoken education. You learn so much more by seeing than by hearing. . .[16]

Miss Cureton's views as to the usefulness of the museum service are echoed by Mr. Coe. When he was asked about the importance of the museum service, Mr. Coe was quite explicit:

> The museum service has been of the very greatest of importance and again one can trace a connection, a similar connection, in the West Riding of Yorkshire which also has a very well organized museum service supporting the schools. If you move out of an utter dependence on books for young children, if you begin to relate books and words to reality they experience . . you need a lot more real things. And this is exactly

> what the museum provides: real things
> from the past, places far away, good
> painting, good pottery, good fabrics,
> interesting things . . . from history,
> things from geography, things from nature,
> from science, and things to do with mathematics
> . . .I couldn't underrate the importance of
> having such a well-organized service.[17]

The Oxfordshire City and Country Museum offers more than just objects for classroom exhibit, its extra-mural loan service. It also runs an extensive intra-mural service. This service sees the Museum Education Officers (Art, Natural Science, History) providing lectures to schools and to classes within schools on a request basis. They are also available to help a teacher organize and carry out field trip experiences for children. Moreover, children may be brought to the main museum building where the Education Officers will help them and their teachers make the best use of the museum, its displays, its visual aids equipment, its art work facilities, and its library. Indeed, these same Education Officers and their museum facilities are available to the area teachers' colleges and to the Oxfordshire teachers' centers as well. Thus, within a very few years, the Oxfordshire City and County Museum, like its forty or more counterparts in other sections of England, has become an indispensible element in the educational affairs of the county. The services offered by these museums vary; some have the extra-mural loan service as well as the intra-mural teaching service while others have only one element of the service. In every instance, the museum's school service comes under the control of the museum's director or under the authority of the local education

authority's chief education officer. In the case of the Oxfordshire service, the general guidance of the service is in the hands of an advisory panel made up of teachers and other professionals which meets three times a year —once each term. On this panel are teachers of all levels including colleges, county and city advisers, and Her Majesty's Inspector in the area. The panel acts only in an advisory capacity, having no executive powers over the museum service. Generally, the panel reviews the acquisitions and may make recommendations as to new acquisitions, and assesses the nature of the services and the manner in which they have been used. The panel, operating in this manner, becomes another agency of communication about the museum as well as being of some guidance to the museum staff as to what the future needs in the schools may be for museum services. A central coordinating and information body links the museums together: the Museums Association's Group for Educational Services in Museums. Here from this London office information regarding services generated by a local museum education service may be disseminated throughout the nation.

Teachers' Centers

At the end of the long lovely green which runs gently uphill from the center of Witney, not far from Oxford, is the old Police Building, a stone block structure of nineteenth Century, Victorian solidity. It housed not long ago the police station and in an

adjacent building of like construction, the magistrate's court. A high stone archway leads into the main building, through which in earlier days a less happy lot entered than those who promise to enter in the near future. This set of buildings was in the summer of 1971 in the midst of extensive renovation. The Witney Teachers' Centre will open in the autumn in these new quarters. Mr. Keith Gordon, appointed last year to be the Curriculum Development Leader at this center, comes newly to the position. He was a secondary school English teacher. In the middle of the summer's heat wave, Mr. Gordon sat in his office amid a clutter of unpacked boxes of curriculum materials, books, rolled posters, saws and hammers, with the sound of construction rising from the adjoining rooms where workmen were finishing the hangings of several doors. The old building was delightfully light and attractive, freshly painted in pastel colors, dominantly pink and yellows, quite in contrast to the formidable grey exterior stone work. Mr. Gordon is a thin man of moderate height, possessed of the lean, athletic appearance of a long distance runner. He slouched in his chair in a sweaty fatigue. As he talked about the work which he envisioned for his center, he seemed completely absorbed in his subject. He pressed his two hands together as he talked, carefully selecting his words. It was clear that the problems of organizing and bringing to life a new teachers' center was pressing on him, clear that he was aware of the promises as well as the pitfalls.

The Witney Teachers' Center serves the geographical area of

The Witney Teachers' Centre serves the geographical area of West Oxfordshire in which are located six secondary schools, twenty-five primary schools, a technical college, and two teachers' colleges. Mr. Gordon's new center will service these institutions. The remaining portions of Oxfordshire will be served by three additional teachers' centers, these to open this autumn also. The Witney Centre, when conversion is completed, will consist of three blocks. First, a small set of rooms will form the offices and seminar rooms of 'The Curriculum Development Area. Second, another set of rooms some distance removed will house the reprographic equipment, recording and television equipment, the audio-visual aids —the hardware— in a Technical Area. Third, a central exhibition and conference hall area is providing in the old but renovated court room itself. Capable of being blacked out, equipped with a large number of electrical outlets, and possessed of the judge's dais at one end of the room, this large hall is a multi-purpose area. As one strolls through the quarters, one is impressed with the thought which has gone into their preparation. A small kitchen area is available for the teachers' use. A workshop complete with power and hand tools is there for teachers to use as they construct teaching aids. The whole center has an attractive, highly useful, warmly pleasing atmosphere and appearance. This center is to become the hub of activities, some of which will come from groups of teachers, others of which will be individual teacher's projects, and still others

of which will be projects generated by the center's Curriculum Direction, Mr. Gordon.

"The need for in-service education is one that is recognized by the authority and is increasingly recognized by the head teachers," said Mr. Gordon. He noted in the course of his remarks that the secondary schools were beginning to change under the impact of the innovative work in the primary schools, that the process of learning was becoming as important to many secondary teachers as the product, and that, in some measure, the secondary schools were beginning to break down the narrow subject matter walls, the compartmentalization of learning. As Mr. Gordon noted:

> The secondary schools . . . are something of a traumatic experience for a child coming from a free and open primary school situation, into the more rigid compartmentalized area of the secondary school. I think linked to this is the need to break down further the very artificial barriers which still exist between certain areas of the curriculum where teachers still look at their subject as a subject and don't in fact see the vast areas of overlap with other subjects that can be brought together.[18]

As curriculum development leader, Mr. Gordon envisons his teachers' centre as a place where secondary and primary teachers can get together and share ideas, where the needs of one can be made known to the other, and where the old, rigid curriculum walls can come tumbling down as a result of free interchange and understanding between teachers. But how to get teachers together—— that, as Mr. Gordon notes, "is the $64,000.00. question!"

> As it exists at the moment, I think it is true to

> both in the evenings and on the weekends than many of their secondary colleagues. . . .As things stand now, we do get a certain number of day or half day courses for which head teachers are prepared to release teachers.[19]

The old problem of getting teachers free from classroom obligations to work on the task of educational curriculum development and self-improvement is a major problem for center leaders. Gordon continues:

> Where it comes to longer courses of in-service training where teachers are possibly meeting together to manufacture equipment or apparatus or courses for schools, and this is going to involve a long commitment of time, the situation will have to continue to be of a voluntary nature in the evenings where we will pay the teachers' expenses, traveling and so on, but they will have to do it out of school in their own time.[20]

Indeed, then, a center leader is faced with a difficult problem of being able to have his facilities used by teachers in times other than late afternoons, evenings, weekends, and holidays. It seems that competition for the teacher's time will continue to plague center leaders, teachers, and head teachers in England as well as their counterparts in America. Gradually, it seems that school systems in England and in America are beginning to make small grants of school time for development work.

A teachers' center represents a substantial investment on the part of a school system. In Oxfordshire, as elsewhere in England, the funds to establish and maintain a teachers' center come from the local authority. The national level, Department of Education and Science, provides no funds to local authorities to help out with teachers' center development. Oxfordshire has

allocated the sum of L3,000. for curriculum development; L1,500,00. is retained by the central office for the general curriculum needs of the country as a whole; the remaining L1,500.00. is divided four ways, among the four new teachers' centers, giving each L375.00. each for their own local curriculum projects. From this latter amount must come all the supplies and books needed to run the center. An audio-visual aids budget covers expenses encountered in that area, and an additional grant of L250. is made to cover speakers' honoraria, teachers's traveling expensing. As Gordon says:

> I think it's true that we're going to have difficulty in keeping to this budget and not over-spending by the end of the year. The more successful the center, the more use made of it, the more the demands up it, the more the expenses mount.[21]

The financing of a teachers' center, indeed, poses some difficult problems. A center suggests continuance and when a system takes on the burden of a center it is taking on a continuing burden, one that not only goes on year after year, but also mounts if it's successful. If the need for educational change is perceived as being necessary by the authority leadership as well as the teachers, if curriculum development and in-service education are thought of as two halves of a whole, then the long range investment in a teachers' center may prove exceedingly rewarding to a system and its teachers.

One of the basic conditions of teachers centers in England

is that they are social centers. In the large cities, it is often true that teachers, once out of school, have no place to gather where they can talk over their problems and their interests, no place where they can work on teaching materials with colleagues, or where they can meet other teachers from other schools. Urban teachers, it is said, suffer a kind of isolation which one would associate with the rural teachers. Indeed, it is true that teachers in rural areas do tend to be isolated from one another, but unlike their urban colleagues they do tend to become members of the small communities in which they live. For an urban teacher, then, a teacher center may provide a common meeting ground for the social activities of teachers whose social lives might otherwise be limited. For a rural teacher, a teacher center provides a gathering place to which teachers from numbers of communities can come to share common interests. In this social sense, teachers' centers are in the best tradition of the English pub. In fact, presently in Oxfordshire, numbers of teachers and advisers are gathering in a local pub, there to share ideas, enjoy poetry reading, and to meet one another socially.

A teachers' center is far more than a social center, however. The center is frequently envisioned as the locus of re-training of teachers, although advisers generally contend that re-training or in-service education for primary teachers particularly is best carried on in their schools. There teachers and advisers can work in the actual conditions in which their pupils will work, and

by moving meetings from school to school, the maximum exposure to the working conditions and ideas of other may be gained. In the final analysis, one senses that there is a head-on role conflict emerging between the advisors who see themselves in the active, on-school role of aiding teachers, and the teacher center leaders who some regard as mere keepers of a building and others see as curriculum development leaders actively engaged in shaping curriculum and methodology. The conflict is far from resolved. As Dr. Vincent Rogers writes,

> These centers seem to be in anything from an embryonic stage to a complete development stage, and argument is strong as to what they should provide. What seems to be the idea behind them? As I see it, the employing Authority provides a building in a particular area. . . in which teachers can meet socially and professionally to talk and work, at times to suit themselves.22

So far so good. However, teachers' centers are precisely that ---organized and operated by teachers. An elected body of teachers organizes to develop a teachers' center and develops sub-committees, as needed, to oversee and to initiate programs. In some centers, no center warden or leader may be hired, the duties being taken over by teachers or committees of teachers or by a teacher granted some released time for minor organizational and leadership functions. In other authorities, the role of the teacher center leader may be implied by his title,"Warden," suggesting a keeper of the establishment more than educational leader. Oxfordshire seems to have combined the role of passive

curriculum development leader. Rogers suggests some of the inherent difficulties in his comments:

> The Center is organized and run by teachers, some of whom form an elected committee with a chairman. Action comes through this elected body and all teachers are at liberty to suggest what organization and activity should be. Ideally, the Center should be available to teachers at all times and should have the services of a "warden" or someone in charge; and it is conceived as providing for the needs of teachers from every section of education. In this way activities can involve cooperation between teachers in primary, secondary, and further education.[23]

To do the kinds of things suggested by Rogers' words, "providing for the needs of teachers from every section of education," requires more role clarification for the center leader than anyone has yet suggested. In a Schools Council report, the issue of leadership is dealt with in more detail:

> The variation in the title, especially between the words 'warden' and 'leader', indicated the first question: what was he appointed as? Three answers were given. . . the most unsatisfactory. . . was as a general 'dogsbody' with duties ranging from summarizing Schools Council working papers to washing up the cups and saucers. A step-up was achieved when his functions were seen to be mainly administrative: the ideal warden was described by one chairman of a management committee as the person who set up everything for the teachers and then faded into the background . . .
>
> A more widely held view was that the warden must be someone who above all could provide leadership because he was a good teacher with the kind of qualifications and experience needed in some crucial area of work being fostered by the centre. The danger here, as some saw it was that really the person appointed would inevitably be forced into the position of sub-adviser.[24]

The Schools Council conferences on teachers' centers emerged with no firm conclusions on the role of the center leader, except

to suggest that 'warden' was a better title than 'leader', and that such a leader should probably have skills in "group discussion work, a sound understanding of behavioural psychology, of work done on curriculum planning, of related fields of sociology, and a working knowledge of resources and information needed by teachers." The Schools Council conference went on to make two significant points regarding the leadership role:

> . . . the relationship of centre leaders with local advisers and with HM Inspectors, was touched upon. There was some suspicion and some dissatisfaction, but, on the other hand, also evidence of willing and fruitful collaboration. The relationship could only be defined against the practical necessities of local conditions. There was one measure of agreement: centre wardens could never carry out the inspectorial and policy-recommendation functions of advisers: to do so would impair the particular quality of their relationship with teachers.
>
> This whole question of role, and of training in the skills required, was bound up with the status of wardens. Where did they fit into the educational pattern. . .[25]

If we labor the question of the role of the center leaders, it is because this newly developed and rapidly growing organization in British education is regarded as being so central to curriculum change. Moreover, the incipient role conflict can be seen in comments by Gordon, the Oxfordshire center leader, and Coe, the Oxfordshire Senior Adviser.

> Coe: The danger with teacher centres is that they can begin to have a life of their own which is divorced from the work of the classroom; they can exist on a different level and there not (be) so relevant and therefore not communicate so strongly to teachers . . .

teacher centres. There will be three in the county working in September. That's a very new development. We see these centres as functioning only in the sense that they can provide something which we cannot provide easily in the schools.

Gordon: We are very often in the situation where we can see things in secondary schools' needs or we can ask for their needs, or we can create the needs, as it were, if we go at it the right way. We can initiate work in the teacher centre on these things, on what we observe of the local county situation.[27]

While Coe was addressing himself to the primary level of schooling and Gordon to the secondary level, there is some difference between the two men's views of the roles involved. As of the summertime when Mr. Gordon was reconstructing his old Police Building, he and Coe seemed to be, in a large measure, in agreement on the primary school level of role interaction. Yet Gordon's insistence that, unlike many other wardens, he has an active role which allows him to enter secondary schools to discover teachers' needs and to create needs may be the element that will bring Oxfordshire advisers and Oxfordshire teacher center leaders into a confrontation. Especially is this so if the teacher center becomes, as it is envisioned it will become, a center in which primary and secondary teachers meet to share problems and directions, curriculum development and materials production. Open, integrated day education of the primary school has a quality of being opposed to a prepared curriculum, a rejection based on the idea that no curriculum can be developed for pupils and brought into the schools without usurping the teacher's main function. On the other hand, [illegible]

where specialization in subject matter persists, are searching for new and relevant curriculum, and the Schools Council is fostering many curriculum development projects which are now being disseminated to the secondary schools and to the primary schools. One of the main arteries of dissemination is the teacher center. It is this function that accounts for much of the growth of centers. Irrespective of the role conflict which lurks beneath the surface of the development and growth of teacher centers, it would seem that their development will continue. As the School Council conference report notes:

> The conference agreed that the local centre was an indispensable instrument of curriculum change; but much more argument and questioning will be required to clarify its use and probable future within the educational system.[28]

English teachers have been justly jealous of their freedom and their autonomy and are quite unlikely to relinquish either to other roles or to new agencies. Teacher center development has not, everywhere, received a favorable vote of confidence. Where such reserve regarding teacher centers is encountered, often it stems from the feeling that the centers, ostensibly controlled by teachers, are in fact manipulated by others for purposes not ~~springi~~ springing from teachers themselves. Clearly, then, in England one may presume that teacher centers will be welcome and effective instrumentalities of curriculum change as long as they are seen as reflecting teachers' needs and teachers' wishes. Yet this situation poses problems too. It is [illegible] teacher centers

may fall into the hands of the activist teachers, those most articulate and, in the sense of education, politically aware and astute. Control of centers by these teachers may scarcely reflect the needs and wishes of the vast majority of teachers. Others see problems for teacher centers if they come to be dominated by secondary people with specific curriculum interests or, on the other hand, by primary people with more generalized interests. How to blend in all teachers in the schools and make sure voices representing all quarters and all points of view are continually heard is as yet an unmet challenge.

As Keith Gordon notes, his section of Oxfordshire includes a technical college and two teacher training colleges. How these institutions will come to be involved with the work of the teachers' centers is yet to be developed. The Plowden Report clearly indicated that such development would be most desireable but was equally vague about what the relationship should be.

> The precise relationship which ought to exist between teachers' centres, institutes of education and colleges of technology will probably vary from area to area but we have little doubt that some kind of partnership is needed.[29]

Writing in the Schools Council Newsletter No. 6, Dialogue, Alex Evans comments,

> . . . the involvement of the Colleges with the Teachers' Centres has not by any means gone far enough. We are pleased to read in DIALOGUE that some Teachers' Centers have linked up with some Colleges but the fact that this is <u>news</u> can disturb as well as please us. . . I know . . . that at

> expressions of regret, and indeed, resentment, that they have not been invited to join the teachers in the Centres and that, although individual lecturers have been involved, there has been no planned attempt to involve the college as a while. . . . . .
> . . . . . .
> There are over a hundred and sixty Colleges of Education. . . No Teacher Centre need be out of touch. . .[30]

Mr. Evans comments elicited responses in a subsequent issue of Dialogue, the general tone of which was to concur with Mr. Evans and to suggest ways in which a mutually beneficial relationship could be established. Teacher centers were seen as places where college lecturers could work on a liaison basis and thereby keep abreast of what curriculum changes were taking place in the schools. Another saw center wardens, LEA advisers, and college lecturers coming each into a shared role, each serving the other through such a new role. Still another saw the teachers' center as being a logical place for the initial placement of student teachers where they might work with teachers and their tutors. This writer noted:

> At Keele students following courses of professional training in education are encouraged to attend meetings of the Science and Technology Center, in whose running, incidentally, the Education Department staff play an active part.[31]

In the development of these new institutions in the education profession, two approaches may be taken. The first approach develops from the belief that administrators or supervisors lead teachers and that, but for such leadership, teachers would seldom

bestir themselves to gain their own improvement. The assumption is that teachers, mired in traditions and working reasonably comfortably with out-of-date ideas, curriculum, and methodology must be provided with a place to which they may be encouraged, pressured, or at the very worst coerced to go. Once there, these teachers' skills and knowledge will be improved; if not improved, the unspoken hope is that they will realize how dreadfully out of touch with modern times they are and this will either motivate them to try to improve or motivate them to retire early. More than one depressed administrator or supervisor has hoped that such might be the case with his reluctant teachers.

The other approach develops from the belief that administrators and supervisors, working with in concert teachers, can develop increased staff competencies and working relationships. It takes the sanguine position that hierachical arrangements of professional positions inevitably interfere with open, free, creative, and imaginative communications on common problems. The assumption which follows from this position is that, if one would avoid the hazards of hierarchy, control of institutions for teacher improvement rightfully belong in the hands of those to be improved. Further, the assumption is that teachers are well aware of their weaknesses, know their strengths, and given a free hand in shaping their own improvements, they will use opportunities for self-improvement willingly. Administrators and supervisors —advisers— can provide for

teachers to provide for children, an environment rich in methods and materials, research developments in curriculum, in-service course work in subject matter areas, and opportunities to meet and share with fellow teachers in the creative process of curriculum development.

If these two positions are at all reasonably described, we may denominate the first as a mildly authoritarian position, one which takes a slightly unfavorable view toward teachers. The second position we may denominate as a less authoritarian position, a democratic position, one which is a slightly more favorable or positive view of teachers. My estimate of the matter is that the British have elected in favor of the second position, and they are willing to suffer the inconveniences, the confrontations, the mis-understandings which may flow from an excess of democracy in professional affairs.

The Schools Council report on teacher centers indicates that there were three-hundred, eight centers throughout England and Wales. My count of teacher centers in 1971 indicates that there are in excess of four hundred, seventy centers. The growth is very rapid, one can see. However, the Schools Council report on the three hundred, eight centers indicated that,

> One hundred thirteen were based in school buildings but had the use of at least one room put aside for centre work; the vast majority of the centres were exclusively or almost exclusively concerned with work in Nuffield or Schools Council projects in mathematics, science, and modern languages;

most of this work is in the primary field.

> Few centres had been purpose-built: only five such listed. The majority, one-hundred seventy-five, were in accommodation that had been adapted and was now specifically allocated for no other function than that of a local centre. Such accomodation included old schools that had been taken over completely, parts of the buildings set aside as a centre, and prefabricated annexes set up on school site; a few authorities had also adapted very confortable and spacious houses. There were thirty-one centres sharing accommodations, most of these being in further education establishments and a few in colleges of education.[32]

The central purpose of these teacher centers is curriculum development work: as the Schools Council report states, "to make possible a review of existing curricula by groups of teachers and to encourage attempts by them to bring about changes."[33] The titles of some of the centers suggests their central concern as well as their variety:

Theater Centre	Rural Studies Centre
Drama Centre	Science Teachers Centre
Primary Math Centre	Craft Centre
Urban Studies Centre	Art and Needlework Centre
Music Centre	Science and Mathematics Centre

These centres are subject-centered institutions, commonly found in larger cities and frequently catering to secondary teachers. By far the largest number of centers are listed under a variety of terms which focuses primarily on the teacher's curriculum development function:

> In-Service Teachers' Centre
> Centre for Teachers
> Curriculum Development Centre
> Curriculum Center
> Education Development Centre

Thus, there emerges a picture of three general kinds of centres. The most common of all is the general teachers' center appealing to the broadest range of teachers, from primary to college, a location where those people can meet and can work on curriculum projects and materials production most useful to them in their immediate classrooms. The second set of teachers' centers are those that are framed around one or two related disciplines. These centers, open to all, have a strong appeal to secondary teachers whose specialization is encompassed by the particular center. Here exchanges of ideas on curriculum developments and production of materials can be carried forward. The third set of centers are those devoted to primary concerns, as centers specializing in new curriculum developments in mathematics and science for primary schools. Such centers seem to be dissemination centers for these particular schools council project developments. It must be said that any attempt to classify or define the nature of teacher centers ultimately fails since each center is a local institution, each an outgrowth of local needs, each an expression of the concerns of local teachers. If this is distressing to those who like neat descriptions and definitions of educational roles and organizations, it should also be heartening to know that, in this day of standardization, a truly democratic spirit is to be found operating among educators and to realize too that in one place teachers are very much in control.

There are a range of purposes that teachers' center may come to perform which are frequently overlooked. In Oxfordshire, as in other parts of England, it is less common than in America for curriculum materials to be purchased as complete, ready-to-use, "teacher-proof" packages or kits or games. Rather it is thought that teachers should make their own materials for the classroom, since in doing so considerably more attention will be paid to the children who will use the materials than will be paid to them if the materials are commercially produced. As John Coe says:

> I think it's very important that teachers should have access to materials so they can make their own learning aids. I am very much more interested in this than supplying our teachers with kits . . . when a teacher has to make or collect a group of things, has to make something for his children, then he has to think about his children and their needs and this is fundamentally the right way to start. If you supply him with a kit of information about the natives of North Borneo, he's hasn't got to think about his children at all. He'll be more concerned with the people from North Borneo and he'll get his children to go through the materials without thinking about them.[35]

This may, indeed, be "fundamentally the right way to start," but thousands of American teachers, and no doubt many British teachers, would feel that this is a burden they would be just as happy not to pick up, totally at least. Yet experienced teachers would have to agree that there is a fundamental truth to Coe's position, and, given that admission, a place to work and supplies to work with make sense. In this respect, then, a teachers' center is a most valuable workshop for teachers, a place where they can begin

project and leave it as a work in progress to be returned to at a later time.

For the parents of children in school, as well as for members of the general public, the teachers' center may become an important educational service. Education is changing rapidly but many people cling to the idea that schools which change dramatically from those to which they went when they were children are, in some measure, less valuable. If school may become a place of enjoyment, a pleasurable experience, where much of the class time seems to be taken up with play, the opinion of many parents and members of the public may be confirmed——hard earned tax money perhaps is being squandered for less than worthy education. Since it is difficult for many parents to visit schools and talk with teachers while school is in session, and since going to school to talk about school work and curriculum developments is something of a mental hazard for some parents, the teachers's center becomes a non-threatening neutral ground. Here there is a professional educator who knows what is going on in the schools and who can explain what developments are taking place. Moreover, teachers may arrange extensive displays of pupil work which may be examined at leisure. Here displays of handwriting, of poetry, art work, science and math work, environmental studies and the like can be set up for parents to see, for center leaders to describe and explain to parents. These same displays, of course,

become sources of ideas for teachers too and the dissemination of ideas about teaching is furthered by these displays.

Should pupils use a teacher center? Some teachers have suggested that older pupils, especially those who may be the first of the new generation to be caught up in the rise in the school leaving age, might find the opportunity to get out of the normal school confines into a more relaxed, less formal atmosphere. There is the general idea that for many of the less successful pupils in secondary school the school's confines, its rule and regulations, its requirements and expectations ——all generally arranged for younger children ——may be inappropriate for the older adolescents. Thus, a teachers' center, receiving minimal usage during the school day, might be an appropriate base for the education of these —or some of these— young men and women. Certainly, the idea has an attractiveness to it, but generally the use of a teachers' center by pupils is regarded as poor policy. There is the feeling that, within short time, the teachers' center would be usurped by the school children. Additionally, the center was created by teachers to meet pressing needs. To prejudice the work and facilities necessary to meet the needs of the teachers by mixing in students would be an unfortunate, however unlikely, result. Teacher centers are important and should not be compromised.

Teachers' centers, then, are rapidly growing instrumentalities

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

as in the most complex form, they have three basic elements: a comfortable place for discussion; a workshop and storage facilities; and some minimal kitchen facilities or hot plate and sink. To the extent that there are comfortable chairs, book cases, a professional library, display areas, and work ~~tables~~ tables——so much the better. Typewriters, ditto or mimeo machines, and audio-visual equipment may be provided. Yet the Schools Council conference on teachers' centers made a most important point:

> Advice was given not to order beyond the obvious minimum of equipment; . . . Much the best policy was for a local education authority to make available to the centre a sum of money that could be used to buy the things needed as demand arose. This step reinforced teacher involvement in, and control of, the affairs of the centre. There could be no independence without the financial means to implement decisions.[36]

There are many unsolved and unexplored area to the development of teachers' centers. In the final analysis, however, the teachers' center stand as an important manifestation of the changing nature of education which is thrusting on schools, and on a public all too often unprepared to accept the idea, the need and the expense of engaging in constant teacher in-service education and constant curriculum development.

The Schools Council

In London's Great Portland Street is the modern building which houses the Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations, one of the two major sources from which, as George Perry of Oxford

Department of Education says, is responsible for the "enormous amount of innovations that has been taking place in this country."[37] This organization, born in 1964 out of a union of previously established committees concerned with secondary curricula and college entrance requirements and examinations, has joined together the two essential ingredients of education ——what is to be studied by school pupils and students and how what is studied is to be assessed. Naturally, the work of the Schools Council has expanded, as, indeed, it was anticipated it should given its sweeping constitutional mandate:

> Object
> 2. The object of the Schools Council shall be the promotion of education by carrying out research into and keeping under review the curricula, teaching methods and examinations in schools, including the organization of schools so far as it affects their curricula.[38]

Clearly those who had a hand in forming the Schools Council had in mind the reformation of English education, much to the distress of some traditional lists and academicians who continue to thunder away at the Schools Council's work in newspaper articles and in their broadsides published in a series critical of education, The Black Papers. As Alan Bullock, the second Chairman of the Schools Council wrote in the first issue of Dialogue, the newsletter of the Schools Council which goes to every school staff room in the country:

> The purpose of the Schools Council . . . is a radical, even revolutionary one . . . But how do you translate the purpose of [the Schools

Council) into practice? There's never been any doubt about the answer . . . the only people who can turn such a programme into something more than words are the teachers.[39]

The Organization of the Schools Council*

GOVERNING (GC) COUNCIL
Ultimate responsibility for Council's policy

PROGRAMME (PC) COMMITTEE
Senior educational policy committee responsible to GC for determination of priorities; oversight of work programs and appointments to subject committees

FINANCE & STAFF COMMITTEE
Financial policy, staffing, audit, advising PC of state of resources

WORKING PARTY ON RELATIONS BETWEEN SCHOOLS COUNCIL & DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE

STEERING COMMITTEE 'A'
Curriculum for pupils 2-13 and detailed proposals for research and development

STEERING COMMITTEE 'B'
As for 'A' but for pupils 11-16; also with 'C' central coordinating authority for Secondary school examinations

FIRST EXAMINATIONS COMMITTEE (FEC)
- CSE sub-Committee
- GCE 'O' Level Sub-committee
- Both support FEC

STEERING COMMITTEE 'C'
As for 'B' but for pupils 14-18

SECOND EXAMINATIONS COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE FOR WALES
Combines 'A', 'B', and 'C' for Wales, except on examinations.

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE
Arrangement publication of materials approved by PC which is responsible for publications policy although GC has overall control

SUBJECT COMMITTEES: Curriculum and examinations in their respective fields:
- English
- History
- Geography
- Science
- Mathematics
- Modern Languages
- Art
- Social Science
- Home Economics
- Physical Education
- Music
- Classics
- Religious Education
- Craft, Applied Science
- General Studies

The organization of the Council takes account the fact that curriculum development is something which happens locally, in a school. It provides as Field Officers seconded teachers whose task it is to maintain personal contacts with schools, teacher centres, LEAs, etc. on a regional basis.

*Adapted from Schools Council, "Question and Answers," Information Sheet.

The Structure of the Schools Council illustrates the* proportion of the teacher representation

	Teachers:	Others:
Governing Council	39	34
Program Committee	9	9
Steering Committee 'A'	15	10
Steering Committee 'B'	15	13
Steering Committee 'C'	16	15
Welsh Committee	14	9
First Examinations Committee	12	10
G.C.E. 'O' Level Sub-committee	12	10
C.S.E. Sub-Committee	9	16**
Second Examinations Committee	12	12***
Subject Committees	10	6
Finance and Staff Committee	4	7
Publications Committee	3	3

*** Some ex-officio members are expected to be teachers; otherwise the teacher majority will be secured by co-options.

*** A proportion of CSE boards' representation is expected to be by teachers; otherwise, the teacher majority will be secured by co-options.

*Adapted from: Schools Council, Dialogue #1, p.4.

Schools Council Structure, briefly explained:*

Governing Council: This committee is the policy making body for the Schools Council, reviewing work of the other committees and referring matters to appropriate committees which comes to its attention from any member of the Schools Council.

Programme Committee: This committee shall have direction of all programs undertaken by the Schools Council or under the schools Council aegis; it shall approve projects for initiation and funding, terminate projects, consider and authorize publications.

Curriculum Steering Committee 'A' This Committee shall have consideration of all matters affecting the curricula and examinations for pupils in the range from two to thirteen, and this committee shall make proposals for expenditures for research and development in this area, and shall make recommendations to the Programme Committee of publications and other materials related to its work.

Curriculum Steering Committee 'B' Like Committee 'A' except that this committee is to consider all matters affecting the curricula and examinations for pupils in the age range from eleven to sixteen. Additionally this committee shall act as central co-ordinating authority for the administrations of examinations normally taken by pupils on attaining age sixteen (First Examination).

Curriculum Steering Committee 'C' Like 'A' and 'B' this committee considers all matters affecting the curricula and examinations of pupils fourteen and upwards.

The Welsh Committee This Committee performs the functions of 'A', 'B', and 'C' for Wales.

*Adapted from Schools Council Constitution, Report 1969/70, pp. 51-64.

The Finance and Staff Committee — This committee fulfills the responsibilities of its title, gaining the approval of the Department of Education and Science and of the local educational authorities of its annual estimate of expenditures, and advises the Programme Committee of the total funds available from year to year or time to time. It considers detailed estimates of project estimates and authorizes the release of funds to them.

The First Examinations Committee — This group works in connection with the SC 'B' in the coordination and administration of examinations policy to SC 'B'.

The Second Examinations Committee — Like the First Examinations Committee, save it works in connection with SC 'C' and also delegates as it sees fit to Subject Committees any matter relating to the approval of a GCE advanced level syllabus.

Nothing quite like the Schools Council exists anywhere in the educational world, according to Dame Muriel Stewart, the School Council's successor to Alan Bullock who took over the reins of the Council when he moved on to become the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford. Indeed, the Schools Council is a creation of government, yet it is independent of them. It has the official endorsement of government, yet it is an unofficial educational organization, unable and unwilling to impress itself or impose itself on any educational body or any teacher. Its own literature stresses again and again that its purposes are educational research and development in the service to teachers. Funded by the Department of Education and Science (formerly the Ministry of Education) and from the Local Educational Authorities, the Schools Council operates and conducts its research and development projects on a budget that is approximately L1,250,000.annually, with something less than L500,000. going to maintain the organization's overhead costs and personnel expenses. The remaining amount is devoted to research projects, generally initiated by one of the lesser bodies of the Schools Council, recommended to the Programme Committee which approves and funds the projects under guiding principles laid down by the Governing Council. It is important to realize at the outset that on all major committees teachers are in the majority by provision of the Schools Council Constitution. Funds also come to educational research and development through the Nuffield Foundation, like but smaller than the Ford Foundation,

which in the past has initiated and funded much research and development work in the area of school mathematics and science. The Schools Council, in some instance here, funds evaluation projects for these Nuffield funded projects. The publications committee of the Schools Council commends to the Programme Committee materials for publication and is responsible for bringing them out. The newsletter, Dialogue, issued once each school term and distributed free to each school in a local authority on the basis of size, is the main means of communicating with teachers. The Schools Council also publishes working papers, progress reports of sub-committees, examination bulletins, and a number of other publications. It arranges for the commercial production of Schools Council project materials, as Breakthrough to Literacy, a Schools Council research and development project in initial literarcy which is based upon linguistic studies and seeks to teach reading and writing to infant school children (five to seven years of age) simultaneously.

At the main headquarters in London, there is the secretariat, the management and operational staff, like so much of the entire personnel of the Schools Council in research and development as in management, made up of people from all ranks of the educational profession on leave for a limited time to the service of the Schools Council. It is common for a head teacher or a LEA official, or a college person, or a member of the DES (Department of Education and Science) to take a two to four year leave to work with the Schools Council. There appears to be a very real desire to keep

Schools Council from developing its own self-perpetuating
ucratic moment its own self-generated agenda of important
rns, by always keeping it very close to the educational
itioners ---the teachers. The organization and operations
e Schools Council seems designed to maintain the traditional
lom and independence of the British teacher.

Since its beginning, the Schools Council has been primarily
rned with education at the secondary level. The post-war
h of the school population, many of whom are now in or are
ding the secondary schools or have passed through the Secondary
ns created after the second world war, has brought great concern
he character and quality of secondary education. What should
e curriculum of these schools? How much should it be like
raditional grammar schools which have in the past sent their
l leavers on to the colleges and universities with a General
ficate in Education (GCE) upon completion of externally
ed examinations at the O-level (the Ordinary) or the A-level
Advanced). How does the student who completes a secondary
tion without going down the rough academic road of traditional
e work leading to college or university preparation present
chnical institutions or other educational institutions or to
yers a profile of his achievements in secondary schools? What
that will lend accurate assessment to what he has studied
ne in school and simultaneously give him a measure of self-
. If a secondary school is not preparing a pupil to meet

THIS PAGE WAS MISSING FROM THE DOCUMENT
THAT WAS SUBMITTED BY THE CLEARINGHOUSE.

PAGES 100-105

Schools Council Report 1969/70:

> The Council has continued to encourage the setting up of local curriculum development centres. In twelve amonths, the number of teachers' centres in England and Wales has increased substantially, from some two hundred seventy in March 1969, to four hundred sixty-six on 1 April 1970. Correspondingly, the field officers have devoted increasing time and priority to visiting centres, to observing curriculum innovations in them, and to building up information available in the Council on their development.[47]

It is also from these centers that the Field Officers come to know of significant local curriculum developments, not under any external sponsorship, which they can then diffuse through their contacts with other schools in their assigned area and which they can make known nationally through the main offices and publications of the School Council itself.

The Schools Council Report for 1969/70 lists ninety-eight projects in which the Schools Council has a direct or an indirect interest and participation. An indirect interest would simply mean that Nuffield has undertaken the project but that the Schools Council has funded an evaluation project. It is impossible to indicate the range of activities represented by these projects but we shall reproduce here a few Report[48] entries which will give something of the character of the work undertaken under Council auspices:

1. Aimes of Primary Education

   A study of teachers' thinking about the aims of primary education (including nursery education) and how these are related to classroom practice. The purpose of the study is to produce a resource book which will help teachers to draw up their

own individual statements of aims and to put them into operation.

3-11 years L18,950 1968/69

Dr. P.M.E. Ashton, School of Education, University of Birmingham, PO Box 363, Birmingham 15

10. Children Explore their Environment

The completion of three short colour films showing how children in primary schools learn through exploration of their environment and how they react when confronted with new problems and learning situations.

5-13 years L3000 1969/70

J. Howard, Bishop Grosseteste College, Lincoln

18. CSE Research

The central theme is research into CSE examination designed to improve their quality. The studies and activities will include estimates of reliability, identification of operational definitions of grades, the blueprinting of examinations, advice and assistance in cross-moderations studies undertaken by the boards, summaries of the values of grades and other related problems which may arise.

15-16+ years L96,000 1969/74

National Foundation for Education Research, The Mere, Upton Park, Slough, Bucks.

39. Humanities Curriculum Project

To develop materials and teaching methods appropriate to enquiry-based courses which cross the traditional subject boundaries between English, history, geography, religious studies and social studies. The project is jointly financed with the Nuffield Foundation and has concentrated on developing strategies for the teaching of controversial human issues to pupils of average and below-average ability. Handbooks and materials (on War and Society, Education, The Family, Relations between the Sexes, Poverty, People and Work, Law and Order, Living in Cities, and possibly Race Relations) are being published from May 1970 onwards by Heinemann Educational.

14-16+ years L174,328 1967/72
Nuffield. L 60,000

L. Stenhouse, C.A.R.E., University Village, University of East Anglia, Norwich NOR 88C (ex Phillips Foresite College of Education, Lewisham Court Road, London, SW16)

48. Keele Integrated Studies

A study to explore the possible means to and meaning of integration in the humanities. The central concern is with the organisation of learning most likely to lead to a relatedness of the disciplines through the concerted action of teams of teachers exploring themes, problems, or areas of enquiry. The project is aimed at the whole ability range. The materials will be published by Oxford University Press.

11-16+ years £44,000 1968/71

D.W. Bolam, University of Keele, Institute of Education, Keele ST5 5BG

50. Mathematics for the Majority

This project, previously known as the Secondary Schools Mathematics Project, aims at providing teachers with guidance and source materials to help them construct courses in mathematics for pupils of average and below average ability. The writings will include applications of mathematics relevant to pupils' experience and should provide them with some insight into the processes that lie behind the use of mathematics as the language of science, and as a source of interest in everyday things. The first three teachers' guides are to be published by Chatto and Windus later in 1970.

13-16 years £83,000 1967/72

Philip Floyd, Institute of Education, University of Exeter, Grandy Street, Exeter EX 3QL

53. Modern Languages

A project established to develop language teacher materials in French, German, Spanish and Russian for pupils between 13 and 16, following earlier development work financed by the Nuffield Foundation. The initial concentration on the oralaural skills is followed by the development of reading and writing. Importance is attached to background information and cultural authenticity. The final versions will be published by E.J. Arnold.

Arrangements are being made with examining boards for pupils using these materials to take special O-level examinations.

13-16 years £331,000 1967/74

D. Rowlands (from January 1970), University of York, Micklegate House, Micklegate, York YO1 1JZ

55. Moral Education

The project is devising curricular materials and teaching methods to help boys and girls adopt a considerate style of life, in which they take others' needs, interests and feelings into account as well as their own. Varied materials (to be published by Longman from 1970) are being developed which involve the use of discussion, role play, creative writing and art. They are designed to help teachers in a wide range of subjects (especially the humanities) and particularly where an understanding of personal relations is important.

13-16+ years £32,000 1967/72

P. McPhail, University Institute of Education, 15 Norham Gardens, Oxford OX2 6PY

95. The Teaching of English to West Indian Children

The aim of the project is to develop materials to help the teaching of English to West Indian children. Research into linguistic, social and emotional problems of these children has been completed and a report entitled Teaching English to West Indian Children: the research stage of the project was published in June 1970 as Working Paper 29. New materials have been developed, based on the research, and these will be tried out in selected schools from September 1970.

7-9 years £24,000 1967/72

J.Wright, Department of English and School of Education, University of Birmingham, P.O. Box 363, Birmingham 15

1. Those projects involve many more teachers than simply those which might be associated directly with the research and development team. This team works through the local education authority to place its work in schools where teachers take on the job of trying out materials and becoming involved with the research and development

group who frequently tour their trial-run area, meeting with teachers, conducting in-service courses in the materials and in methodologies. Not infrequently, project teachers are gathered in to conferences to discuss the progress of the work and future directions. There is a constant on-going involvement and the process of change, it is said, is stimulated, not merely by the project and its materials, but also by inter-action of peoples, the breaking of the isolation which so easily comes to the classroom teacher. As one might expect, the locus of much of this work is the newly developed teachers' center.

It is not too much to say that the Schools Council has become the primary agency linking those concerned with educational progress in Britain. Not unanimously applauded for its work, regarded by some as a great expense in a time of financial stringency, portrayed as a central body which might usurp the local teacher's innovative role and infringe upon her freedom through curriculum development projects, characterized by more conservative elements as the handmaiden of permissiveness and mis-rule, the Schools Council is, nonetheless, a power in British educational affairs, one which in its organization and constitution, in its staffing and operations, in its involvement of teachers and in its projects seems to have exemplified the best in the British democratic tradition.

V

> It is often said, by the heedless, that we are a conservative species, impervious to new ideas. I have not found it so. I am often appalled at the avidity and credulity with which new ideas are snatched up and adopted without a scrap of sound evidence.
>
> —Bernard Shaw

Some British educators, watching the parade of American visitors streaming to England to see their schools, must pause to wonder on occasion about the source of their avidity for open, integrated day education. It is not that Americans are particularly credulous that they are so ready to adopt much of British primary education and its methods. It is that, for reasons not fully understood but not too difficult to estimate, open, integrated day education makes a great deal of sense to Americans. After more than a decade of "break-throughs" in education, from teaching machines and programmed learning to curriculum projects and "teacher proof" materials, an educational model has come along which reasserts the primacy of the teacher's role. British open education has a character of warmth, a central humanistic concern, which is attractive to teachers (to

principals and supervisors too) because it fosters educational growth, the excitement of learning, for teachers as well as children. If, indeed, pupils have suffered from the sterility of the "closed" classroom, then the teachers have suffered equally. The first lesson to be drawn from the British educational scene is that there are so many Americans who are interested in it," willing to go to England to see what's happening. Granted that there may be some holiday-making to these jaunts —rather less than one might expect, American teachers have, nonetheless, found a model of education which restores dignity to both the learners and the teachers. As Lilian Weber notes, American principals should welcome the open education movement since,

> "Believe it or not, these principals have had a lot of years of teaching and study and then they're stuck in the schools —patrolling halls, making up schedules and yelling in the lunchroom. They ought to be insulted. Some way or other, one must bring this to their notice, so they get a sense of shock and revolt."[1]

That's what has been so dreadful in American public education. In so many ways, even in the best of schools, there are countless, daily insults to the dignity, the individual worth, the humanity of each child, each teacher, and each administrator. So many, So frequent. So pervasive that those who suffer the indignity of the insult come not to suffer at all but to accept as a necessary part of a system, as normal, these petty assaults on integrity and worth. What it all means is that we must give an entirely new level of regard to the teacher. The teacher can

no longer be considered the botton of the professional heap in terms of respect, dignity, and authority over the affairs of the professional life of the school. Demeaning controls placed on teachers and unreasonable demands made of teachers rob them of independence, intelligent actions, creativity and imagination thereby reducing much of what should be the most exciting part of professional life —teaching— of its joy. If we will have better education —formal or informal— we must give to teachers what we would have then give to children. Openness in education, with all that it implies, is not for children alone.

This attitudinal change must come to administrators and to supervisors, locally and nationally. It must spread throughout the educational scene, upward through the layers of administration in a system, into the ranks of those in colleges of education, into the state departments of education, and into the US Office of Education. When we realize that most of the vast super-structure of American public education is made up of those who don't teach, and who haven't taught for years, it seems a little wearisome to expect much improvement in education to come through the efforts of teachers using the latest educational hardware, the most recent "teacher proof" curriculum, the most attractively retreaded set of commercial textbooks, or the latest in computerized scheduling —little or none of which the teacher has had a hand in making!

American teachers watching British teachers see, not the remote and mechanistic approach to educational improvement, but people like themselves in charge of their own destiny. That is what excites American teachers.

There is much in British primary and secondary education which, depending upon one's outlook and philosophical disposition, is both good and bad, to use rather inadequate terms. There is no need to debate the issue here. It is important that American principals and teachers believe they see in British schools a quality of life and learning seldom realized in American schools —and this, almost uniformly, they like.

If there is any single important lesson we may learn from the British, at this point, it is that we need not fear freedom. Our teachers can handle it and so can our students. We need to give much greater attention to the opportunities available to teachers to freely participate in policy and decision-making at all levels of our educational enterprise. It is not that we do not need experts in all fields of education, it is that we must involve and listen much more carefully to the teachers, to those educational practitioners who know the classroom scene and the pupil needs first hand as experts may not. In this connection, perhaps it is well for us to stop fighting old battles, between traditionalists and progressives, between administrators and teachers, between one level of education and another, and realize that, like it or not, all educational enterprise is [illegible]

bound together: what serves one ill or well ultimately serves another in much the same manner.

I believe our British friends, if I listened to them attentively, would tell us to focus more on the child and less on the things of education which surround the learning the child is supposed to do. Over and over, British educators referred to the child, not to curriculum or to materials or to educational hardware. "Is it good for the child?" seems to be the watchword. Here one must distinguish between being child-centered and being child-indulgent. I know of no British educator who makes a case for indulging children. There can be no case made either for the trivial, the transient, or the trashy in education: schools are, the British say, places of learning. Because one is child-centered, works out of the interests of the pupil, and grants pupils great freedom, one is not simply a teacher in a classroom to endorse aimlessness, meandering inattentiveness, or sheer disruptive foolishness. In connection with giving much more attention to the child, the British example, were we to follow it, would have us center our work around the developmental psychology of Jean Piaget. At least, we need to give much deeper thought to the nature of child growth and development as these interplay with our instructional role and with the materials we use in our teaching. Curriculum concerns may have dominated learning issues, and a shift in focus from the one to the other may be appropriate.

We need seriously to consider the use of tests in our teaching, especially standardized tests for the diagnosis of children's intelligence and abilities. As British advisers regularly point out, there is no real danger in tests themselves; they are part of a teacher's important resources when used internally. However, as John Coe says,

> Authorities which remove external examination pressures earliest are the ones that get better quality into the childrens' lives.[2]

Tests, then, are a resource for teachers to use to come to know better children. They should be used when the teacher feels the need to use them, not on some pre-determined schedule by age and grade. The most anti-individualistic,de-humanizing measure is to use tests, say, with all seventh graders, mounting the test in room after room, giving the instructions over the intercommunications system in a disembodied voice while the teachers in the rooms procter the examination scene to make sure that, when it says, "Stop. Do not go on until told to do so!" that is, indeed, what the children do.

In any event, there must be a much closer relationship between teaching and testing, and this relationship must be in the hands of the teacher who handles both aspects. We may take our direction from the title of the Schools Council, which expresses three central thoughts: Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations, a national body concerned with courses and with standards on which teachers are in the majority. We need this combined emphasis. It may be that we need a Schools Council. Certainly

this needs much further study.

I have no doubt that we must revise our thinking about curriculum specialists, curriculum directors, or curriculum supervisors. Two things seem vitally important. We need many more of them in our schools' systems. It is generally an undermanned role. And secondly, we need them in support of teachers in classrooms. Such curriculum people must, indeed, be our best teachers and they must continue, in some manner, to teach. Since it is unlikely that we shall find the principal of an American school freed to the point where he can come to occupy a role like the British head teacher, it seems most appropriate that the supervisor or curriculum specialist fill in here. The actual definition of this role, its place in the hierarchy of staff positions, its pay scale, its subsidiary benefits should be left to be worked out locally. I do wish to stress that both John Coe and George Perry, as well as numerous others, stressed the importance of the advisory service of the local educational authority to originating, sustaining, and fostering of change and innovation. The local adviser —a term which seems much more congenial to me now than does my own, "Director" — or advisers become the cutting edge of change in a system. It may be well to recall that in Oxfordshire (not Leicestershire), the advisers are instrumental in picking the men who will be the head teachers. I imagine that this practice might engender some degree of controversy in our systems, but it's well worth contemplating!

We must probably reassign our training budgets in this country so that much more of our resources are given over to the in-service education of teachers than to the pre-service education of would-be teachers. We will continue to need new teachers, yes; but the important priority now is to provide opportunities for the teachers presently in the schools to learn new information, new methods to teach subject matter or to integrate subjects, and new ways to work with children, as much at the college and university level as at the nursery school level. John Coe says it well:

> At the moment, we are spending 95% of our resources on initial training and only 5% of our resources on subsequent training. We need to even things up.[3]

Certainly, were we to "even things up," it would spell a new role for schools of education ——a challenging role which many schools of education might find exciting to tackle.

It would seem that teachers' centers, such as the British are rapidly developing now in many locations, may need to be thought through in the light of our own local conditions. It is certainly true that if we switch our concern from the pre-service training of teachers to the in-service training of teachers, and if we want very heavy involvement from schools of education as well as academic departments, we may have to provide some kind of intermediate location for such training to take place. I think it ill-behooves us to place teacher re-training back in the same campus situation which so commonly ill-prepared us to begin with.

THIS PAGE WAS MISSING FROM THE DOCUMENT
THAT WAS SUBMITTED BY THE CLEARINGHOUSE.

and so on. If we tend to be overly concerned with these things, then we can take inspiration from the British practice and hope that they will appreciate —rather than scorn, as some do— the Americans concern for educational technology. Certainly, we must give some serious thought to the degree of control exercised over the minds of both teachers and pupils by the commercial enterprises who provide most of our classroom materials and hardware. Teachers cannot be free to really meet the needs of pupils if they continue to be locked into using a basal series of texts or have available no resources other than texts with which to teach children. Nor can they be free if they must use hardware or facilities they've had no hand in selecting. Materials serve teachers; not teachers the materials. The whole notion of prescribed textbook lists for courses, of single or multiple adoptions, is contrary to education in its most fundamental form. I should submit that what the teacher cannot control, she cannot be held responsible for. If text and material seclection is really out of her hands, then it is truly no longer possible for her to meet the needs of her pupils as distinct from some other pupils elsewhere. If we fail to subscribe to this premise, then teachers become replaceable parts in a mechanistic systen which, having denied integrity and intelligence in the teacher, must deny individuality to children. Irrespective of the merit of the argument, some serious attention must be given to the influence of the commercial

enterprises on education. We might do well to invest our school dollars in support of museum services and field trip opportunities and facilities. Indeed, if openness comes to education, we may find that we shall bus and fly children to all kinds of locations for educational purposes, for day long trips and for month long tours. The walls of the classroom are an impediment to learning in the open school; one may presume that the walls of a school building and the confines of the school grounds may be a similar impediment if open education comes to be extended upward through the grades. Models of this kind of education are to be found now, but the practical application in a public school setting is rather limited.

We now address the central point in all of this concern for innovation. Ultimately it is not any kind of doctrine of open education which is important; it is what happens to teachers and to children. What supports and sustains creative teachers in what must concern us. We know that the British model has shown us a strong advisory service, a rich opportunity for in-service courses, and administrator in the building who is a teacher, a proper regard for the place of testing and standards, and a museum service which richly endows a classroom with things from which children may learn. We know the British model of vertical grouping and of subject integration makes for exciting primary classrooms but that all is not trouble-free at the upper, secondary grade levels, and in the transitions from one level to another.

We have, indeed, been shown that teachers and children can handle both freedom and responsibility. Most of all, we have learned that we must work out our own answers in our own way. We may draw on the experience of others, but we must evolve our own open education, if that is what we shall ultimately call it. There is nothing in the British model that cannot take hold in our culture, will not flourish in our culture. However, we need to do our own work because, in becoming involved in the process, we may transform ourselves, and may transform the institutions which now seem to be so rigidly containing us. The British model is exceedingly valuable for us. It gives us the encouragement to hurry on with the task of rebuilding American public education, to be impatient with those who would fight change, even for the sake of change. John Coe should have the last words:

> I think if we look at the needs of society for a moment, as distinct from the needs of the individual, in both countries, we can see clearly that there is no lack of intellectual development. Indeed, the intellectual standards of our two nations are higher than they have ever been in the whole of the history of man. . . But in both nations, ~~indee~~ indeed in every nation in the world, we can see quite clearly that the affective side of education is lacking. People are hostile to each other. They are hurting each other. They are destroying life. They are so casual in their control of the environment that their waste materials could destroy the environment. . . . . Thus, the great need in society is for the affective, for not only the skills but how we use the skill for each other and for everyone. Now therefore,

> let us right the balance, but, having said that, I wouldn't want to give any impression that intellectual development is not important. Indeed, we find that if you give a little more time to the children and to their affective development, if you improve the quality of life for them, then the intellectual development is better . . . . . The affective and the intellectual sides of human beings are deeply interlocked. They are not separate. So that, if we enhance one, we enhance the other. The new technique in (British education) is to concentrate on the development of children.

Perhaps it is now time for all of us who are concerned with American education to improve "the quality of life" in American schools, for all teachers and for all pupils of all ages.

Notes:

Chapter I

1. Dr. Anthony Kallet, "Some Recent Changes in the Primary School," in In Our Experience, ed. by S.C. Mason (London: Longman Group Limited, 1970), p.33.

2. G. H. Bantock, "Discovery Methods, "Black Paper Two, (London: The Critical Quarterly Society, 1969), pp.115-116.

3. George W. Perry, Senior Staff Tutor, interview with the author, the Department of Educational Studies, University of Oxford, July 6, 1971.

Chapter II

1. Lorna Ridgeway and Irene Lawton, Family Grouping in the Primary School, (London: Ward Lock Educational, 1969), p. 14.

2. Mary Brown and Norman Precious, The Intergrated Day in the Primary School, (London: Ward Lock Educational, 1970), p.68.

3. Ibid., p. 69.

4. Miss [illegible]e Jeffery, "Infants in an Open Plan School," in In Our Experience, ed. by S.C. Mason, p. 42.

5. Children and Their Primary Schools, A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England), Vol. 1., Lady Plowden, Chairman, (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1967.), para. 811, p.288. Referred to as the Plowden Report.

6. Ibid., p. 388.

7. Ibid., para. 819, p.291.

8. Robert Dearden, "What Is The Integrated Day?" in The Integrated Day in Theory and Practice, ed. by Jack Walton (London: Ward Lock Educational, 1971), p. 54.

9. Walton, "What Should We Do and In What Manner?" in The Integrated Day, ed. by Jack Walton. p. 10.

10. Arthur Razzell, Juniors: A Postscript to Plowden, (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1968), pp. 24-25.

11. Bentley Glass, "The Disciplines in a Changing World," in Five Levels of Incompetence, Higer Education, Teaching and the Education of Teachers, The Grove Park Institute, (Consortium of Professional Associations for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs, Washington, DC, 1969), pp. 21-25.

12. Brown and Precious, The Integrated Day, p. 12.

13. Ibid., p. 40.

14. Ibid., p. 123.

15. G. W. J. Crawford, "The Primary School: A Balanced View," Black Paper Two, p. 97.

16. Ieuan Lloyd, "The Integrated Day in the Primary School," in The Integrated Day, ed. by Jack Walton, p. 29.

17. Ibid., p. 26.

18. Keith Gordon, Curriculum Development Leader, interview, Witney Teachers' Centre, July 11, 1971.

19. Susanna Millar, The Psychology of Play, (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1968), pp. 51-58.

20. Elizabeth Hall, "A Conversation with Jean Piaget and Barbel Inhelder, "Psychology Today, May 1970, pp. 30-31.

21. Stewart C. Mason, "School Buildings," In Our Experience, pp. 5-6.

22. Jean Jacques Rousseau, The Emile of Jean Jacques Roussean, (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia, 1963), p. 50.

Chapter III

1. Miss M. P. H. Medhurst, Head Teacher, June 29, 1971, Speedwell Infants School, interview, Littlemore, Oxfordshire.

2. Casey and Lisa Murrow, Children Come First, (New York: American Heritage Press, 1971), p. 16.

3. John Coe, address to University of Connecticut Group, Oxford, June 23, 1971.

4. John Coe, Senior Adviser, Oxfordshire Schools, interview, Oxford, July 5, 1971.

5. George Perry interview.

6. Coe interview.

7. Horth, The Integrated Day, ed. by Jack Walton, p. 40.

8. The Plowden Report, Vol. 1., para. 875.

9. Razzell, Juniors, A Postscript. . ., p. 33.

10. Tyrrell Burgess, "Introduction", Dear Lord James, ed. by Tyrell Burgess, (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1971), pp. 10-11.

11. Jane Adcock, Probationary Teacher, interview, Thame, England, June 28, 1971.

12. Coe interview.

13. Ibid.

14. The Plowden Report, Vol. I, para. #929-931, p.332.

Chapter IV

1. Coe interview

2. "A Problem of Continuity," Dialogue, Schools Council Newsletter #6, (London: Schools Council, August 1970), p.15.

3. Coe Interview

4. Richard Vines, primary adviser, interview, John Hampden Country Junior School, Thame, June 28, 1971.

5. Murrows, Children Come First, p. 133.

6. The Plowden Report, Vol. I, para. 944-946, pp. 335-336.

7. Ibid.

8. Perry interview.

9. Ibid.

10. The Plowden Report, Vol. I, para. 509, p. 189.

11. Coe Interview

12. Murrow, Children Come First, p. 143.

13. Miss Alison Cureton, Museum Education Officer, Oxfordshire, City and County Museum, Woodstock, interview, July 2, 1971.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid.

17. Coe interview

18. Gordon interview

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid.

22. Vincent R. Rogers, Teaching in the British Primary Schools, (London: The Macmillan Company, 1970.), p. 280.

23. Ibid.

24. Schools Council, Teachers' Centers and The Changing Curriculum, SC Pamphlet 6,(London: Schools Council, 1970), pp. 24-26.

25. Ibid.

26. Coe interview

27. Gordon interview

28. Schools Council, Teachers' Centers, SC Pamphlet 6.

29. The Plowden Report, Vol. I, para. 674, p. 245.

30. Alex Evans, "Teachers, Trainers and Development Centres," Dialogue, Schools Council Newsletter No. 6, p. 3.

31. David Tawney, "Teachers, Trainers and Development Centres," Dialogue, Schools Council Newsletter No. 7, p.11.

32. Schools Council, Teachers' Centers, SC Pamphlet 6, p. 7.

33. Ibid., p. 11.

34. Schools Council, "List of Teachers' Centres in England and Wales," May 1971. (Available from Schools Council, 160 Great Portland Street, London W1N 6LL, England).

35. Coe interview

36. Schools Council, Teacher Centres, SC Pamphlet 6, p. 14.

37. Perry interview

38. Schools Council Report 1969/70, (London: Evans Bros. 1970), p. 51.

39. Allan Bullock, "Commentary," Dialogue, Schools Council Newsletter No. 1, (London: Schools Council, 1968), p.3.

40. Perry interview

41. Half Our Future, A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education, (England), J. H. Newsom, Chairman, (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1963), p. xv.

42. Schools Council, Report 1969/70, p.8.

43. Perry interview

44. Rogers, "The Teacher and the Council," Dialogue, No.1, p.4.

45. Ibid., p. 8.

46. "Field Officers for the Council," Dialogue No. 2, p. 4.

47. Schools Council, Report 1969/70, p.8.

48. Ibid., pp.21-47. *Item #1 and subsequent items in this series are drawn from this source. The Schools Council Report 1969/70 is available for the Schools Council, 160 Great Portland Street, London, W1N, 6LL, England).

Chapter V

1. Walter Schneir and Miriam Schneir, "The Joy of Learning —In the Open Corridor," New York Times Magazine, April 4, 1971, p.98.

2. Coe interview.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

Bibliography

Athey, Irene J. and Rubadeau, Duane, ed. Educational Implications of Piaget's Theory. Waltham, Massachusetts: Ginn Blaisdell, 1970.

Barnouw, Elsa and Swan, Arthur. Adventures with Children in Nursey School and Kindergarten. New York: Agathon Press, Inc., 1970.

Barth, R.S. and Rathbone, Charles H. "The Open School: A Way of Thinking About Children, Learning and Knowledge," The Center Forum, January 1970.

Beard, Ruth M. An Outline of Piaget's Developmental Psychology for Students and Teachers. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.

Bassett, G.W., Innovations in Primary Education, London: Wiley, 1970.

Blackie, John. Inside the Primary School, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1967.

Brearley, Molly. The Teaching of Young Children. New York: Schocken Books.

Brown, Mary, and Precious, Norman. The Integrated Day in the Primary School. London: Cox and Wayman, 1970.

Bruner, Jerome S. Toward a Theory of Instruction. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1966.

Burgess, Tyrrell, ed., Dear Lord James. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Litd., 1971.

Cazden, Courtney B. Infant School. Newton, Massachusetts: Educational Development Center, 55 Chapel Street., 1969.

Callum, Albert. Push Back the Desks. New York: Citation Press, 1969.

Collins, Mildred. Students into Teachers. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.

Cox, C. B. and Dyson, A. E. Fight for Education, A Black Paper. London: The Critical Quarterly Society.

Cox, C. B. and Dyson, A.E., eds. Fight for Education, A Black Paper. London: The Critical Quarterly Society. (2 Radcliffe Avenue, London NW10).

———. The Crisis in Education, Black Paper Two. London: The Critical Quarterly Society.

_____. Goodbye Mr. Short, Black Paper Three. London: The Critical Quarterly Society.

Cremin, Lawrence A. The Transformation of the School. New York: Knoph, 1968.

Dennison, George. The Lives of Children. New York: Randon House, 1969.

Gardner, D. E. M. Experiment and Tradition in Primary Schools. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd. 1966.

Holt, John. How Children Learn. New York: Pitman Publishing Co., 1967.

_____. How Children Fail. New York: Pitman Publishing Co., 1967.

_____. The Underachieving School. New York: Pitman Publishing Co., 1969.

Hopkins, Lee Bennett. Let Them Be Themselves. New York: Citation Press, 1969.

Isaacs, Susan. The Nursery Years. London: Routledge & Kegan, Paul, 1971.

Jackson, Philip W. Life in Classrooms. New York: Hold, Rinehart, Winston, 1968.

James, Charity. Young Lives at Stake. Glasgow: Collins, 1968.

Johnson, Harriet. School Begins at Two. New York: Agathon Press, 1970.

Koerner, James, D. Who Controls American Education? Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Mason, Stewart C. In our Experience. London: Longman Group Limited, 1970.

Miller, Susanna. The Psychology of Play. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1971.

Murrow, Casey and Lisa. Children Come First. New York: American Hertiage Press, 1971.

Newsom, J. H. et. al., Half Our Future, A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England). London: Her Majerty's Stationery Office, 1963.

Pedley, Robin. The Comprehensive School. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books Ltd., 1963.

Peters, R.S., ed. Perspectives on Plowden. London: Routledge & Kegan, Paul, 1969.

Plowden, Lady Bridget et. al., Children and Their Primary Schools: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England). London: Her Majerty's Stationery Office, 1966.

Rance, Peter. Teaching by Topics. London: Redwoord Press Limited, 1969.

Razzell, Arthur. Juniors: A Postscript to Plowden. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1969.

Richardson, Elwyn. In the Early World. New York: Pantheon, 1964.

Ridgway, Lorna, and Lawton, Irene. Family Grouping in the Primary School. London: Redwoord Press Limited, 1969.

Rogers, Vincent. The Social Studies in English Education. London: Heinemann, 1968.

Rogers, Vincent. Teaching in the British Primary School. London: The Macmillan Company, 1970.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. The Emile of Jean Jacques Rousseau. ed., William Boyd, Classic in Education No. 10. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Sealey, L. G. W. and Gibbon, Vivian. Communications and Learning in the Primary School. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Taylor, Joy. Organising and Integrating the Infant Day. London: George Allen and Unwin Limited, 1971.

van der Eyken, Willem. The Pre-School Years. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1969.

Walton, Jack, ed. The Integrated Day in Theory and Practice. Edinburgh: Neill and Company Limited, 1971.

Webb, Lesley. Modern Practice in Infant School. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1969.

Williams, Rosemary. Reading in the Informal Classroom. Newton, Massachusetts: Educational Development, 55 Chapel Street.

Yeomans, Edward, Education for Initiative and Responsibility. Boston: National Association of Independent Schools, November 1967. (Available $1.00 from NAIS, 4 Liberty Square, Boston, 02109, Massachusetts).

Journals, Magazines, Periodicals

Featherstone, Joseph, "The Primary School Revolution in Britain." The New Republic, 1967. (Combines three articles appearing in issues of August 10, September 2, and September 9, 1967. Reprints can be ordered from The New Republic, 1244 - 19th St., Washington, DC,20036).

Gross, Beatrice and Ronald, "A Bit of Chaos," Saturday Review, May 16, 1970.

Granis, Joseph C. "The School as a Model of Society." Harvard Graduate School of Education Association Bulletin, Vol. 12, No. 2, Fall, 1967.

Hall, Elizabeth, "A Conversation with Jean Piaget and Barbel Inhelder." Psychology Today, May 1970, pp. 30-31.

Hawkins, David, "Messing About in Science." Washington, DC: Science & Children, Vol. 2, No. 5 (February, 1965).

Kallet, Anthony. "Some Thoughts on Children and Materials." Mathematics Teaching No. 40 (Autumn, 1967), Association of Teachers of Mathematics, Vine Street Chamers, Nelson, Lancashire.

Kallet, Anthony. "Two Classrooms." This Magazine is About Schools, Vol. 1, No. 1 (April 1966), Toronto, 1966 (Reprints available $2.50 from Johnson Reprints Corp., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10003.)

Schnier, Walter and Miriam, "The Joy of Learning — In the Open Corridor." New York Times Magazine, April 4, 1971, p. 98.

Schools Council for Curriculum and Examination Publication (Address: Information Section, 160 Great Portland Street, London, w.1.)

Mathematics in Primary Schools. London: Schools Council Curriculum Bulletin No. 1., Her Majerty's Stationery Office, 1969.

Dialogue, Schools Council Newsletter

List of Teachers' Centers in England and Wales, May 1971.

First Year, An account of the work of a teachers' centre (SC Pamphlet 1), 1969.

Teachers' centres and the changing curriculum (SC Pamphlet 6), 1970.

Integrated studies in the first years of secondary school, (SC Pamphlet 7), 1970.

Schools Council Titles from Evans/Methuen Educational Ltd. (Sales Department, Evan/Methuen Educational, 11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE. or from Citation Press, Scholastic Magazine Inc., 50 W. 44th Street, New York, N.Y. 10036).

Schools Council Report 1969/70, 72pp. SBN 423 44000 4, London: Evans/Methuen, 1970. (or Citation Press, Scholastic Magazines Inc., 50 West 44th Street, New York,NY 10036).